

end a serious menace to the peace and security of the Panama Canal and the entire Western Hemisphere.

MORANO's message to Dulles said, "Grave situation in Costa Rica constitutes serious menace to the peace and security of the Panama Canal and the entire Western Hemisphere. I respectfully urge immediate and vigorous action by the United States under your personal direction within the framework of the Organization of American States to bring about cessation of hostilities and needless bloodshed."

Elaborating on his message, MORANO said, "The sending of a peace observation commission by the OAS is a good, positive first step. We must have the facts. However, all immediate steps must be taken to insure that the increasingly bitter struggle does not further expand into a major holocaust which will endanger the peace of the Western Hemisphere."

"I am in hopes that the situation can be settled swiftly through OAS action under the direction of our able Secretary of State."

Filbert Growers Ask More Time for Tariff Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there are in the States of Ore-

gon and Washington about 1,000 families who make their livelihood by the raising of filbert nuts. It requires many years to bring one of these nut orchards into a bearing state. Every orchard therefore represents a tremendous investment in time, money, and labor.

If anything happens that undermines the prosperity of nut raising, the growers lose not only a year of profits. They must abandon their orchards, cutting them down in order to go into some other activity. They lose all of the investment made in effort and money to get the orchards into a production stage.

It is this possibility of sacrificing years of labor that causes nut growers generally to be greatly concerned in tariff rules and regulations, for the nut growers, chief competition comes from low-wage foreign nations which, like our own, have large nut crops.

Hearings have been set in a new reciprocal trade bill known as H. R. 1. This bill may have a bearing on the entire future of the American filbert-nut industry and all persons engaged in it. The nut raisers want a chance to be heard on this bill. The hearings have been speedily called on H. R. 1 and the nut growers fear may be quickly ended. They fear they may be denied a chance to be heard. The nut growers should be given that opportunity. The hearings should be long enough so that they and those of all other interested industries may get their viewpoint into the record.

The Congress or any of its committees should not proceed so fast that it is un-

fair to any industry or the people engaged in it.

A typical letter, deploring the haste with which hearings on H. R. 1 have been called, is the following one which I have received from John E. Trunk, general manager of the Northwest Nut Growers. Mr. Trunk's letter follows:

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: While we have been anticipating the introduction of legislation advocating the lowering of tariffs, we find ourselves totally unprepared to cope with the haste in which this has been done during the current session of Congress.

Very much to our surprise, the Cooper tariff bill, H. R. 1, is the first to be introduced at this session, and even more alarming is the fact that hearings are scheduled to start on Monday, January 17. This notice is so short that we are simply not able to prepare and present our case.

The congressional delegations from Oregon and Washington have always stood solidly behind the efforts of our filbert and walnut industries in resisting tariff reductions and the ultimate destruction of our business. I am confident we will have the same wonderful support from you and the others during this session. Apparently it is going to be a rugged fight, but we had better win it or we are going to be out of business.

Probably the best immediate service which you can render to us is to get the hearings on H. R. 1 delayed until the nut industry can prepare itself for an adequate presentation.

Sincerely yours,
NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in the supremacy of spiritual verities, in those deep and holy foundations which the Founding Fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the wicked imagine a vain thing, when the angry passions of men are constantly bursting into devouring flame, enable Thy servants here in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. Make us ever loyal to the high adventure which seeks the larger, nobler way for our struggling race to live together in concord, according to Thy will for the good of all Thy children. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, appeared in his seat today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate next Tuesday, as we have an extraordinary occasion in Pennsylvania, the inauguration of a Democratic Governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPOSITION OF ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to composition of the Armed Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of January 13, 1955 (pp. 277-278, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).)

COMPENSATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 69)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to compensation of military personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of January 13, 1955 (pp. 278-279, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).)

REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accom-

panying reports, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Second Annual Reports of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

(Enclosure: Report concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

REPORT OF CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1955.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make. At the last session of the Senate I stated to the Senate that there was on the table the Daniel resolution, Senate Resolution 18, and that, if it was agreeable to the minority leader and to Senators on the other side, as well as those on this side, at the conclusion of the morning hour we would proceed to the consideration of that resolution, in the hope that action would be taken today.

So far as I know, there is no desire, in view of the fact that some Members of the Senate are absent, to ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution. Of course, any individual Senator may make such a request. If that should be done, a request may be made that the resolution go over until there can be a fuller attendance.

I desired to make this announcement so that Senators who have plans for to-

day may know that as soon as the morning hour is over I shall ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 18, with the hope that prompt action will be possible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL OF ACTIVITIES OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A communication from the President of the United States giving his approval of the emergency undertaking by the Virgin Islands Corporation of certain activities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering receipts, expenditures, and work of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico, in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF COPIES OF OFFICIAL RECORDS BY DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), reporting, pursuant to law, on the average monthly flight pay of certain officers in the Navy, for the 6-month period ended January 1, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Air Force entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE ELEMENT, AIR FORCE, AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the

second quarter of fiscal year 1955 there was an aggregate of 2,662 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Inc., for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SALINE WATER CONVERSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the saline water conversion program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BIENNIAL INSPECTION OF HULLS AND BOILERS OF CARGO VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN PIPE LINE CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, final valuations of properties of certain pipeline carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 68th annual report of that Commission, dated November 1, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ROBERT BURNS DEWITT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the establish-

ment of a Young American Medal for Bravery and a Young American Medal for Service and the awards thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE OCCASIONED BY VESSELS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF JOHN LLOYD SMELCER v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 335, 81st Congress, 2d session, that court's opinion in the case of *John Lloyd Smelcer v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Col. W. H. Boshoff, United States Army, retired, of Bad Nauheim, Germany, relating to the release of his house in Bad Nauheim requisitioned by the Army of occupation of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Defense, Pierre, S. Dak., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an interstate civil-defense compact entered into by the State of South Dakota with the State of Arkansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, at Asbury Park, N. J., relating to the imposition of additional taxes on pari-mutuel wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by Henry J. Melloy, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, of Bettendorf, Iowa, praying for a redress of grievances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Caroline McDonald Wismler, of Washington, D. C., relating to the settlement of her claim against the estate of Henrietta E. Garrett, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., relating to Federal aid for reconstruction of highway bridges involved in the Calumet-Sag project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Memorials of sundry citizens and organizations of the United States, remonstrating

against the censure of Senator McCARTHY; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make available to the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, funds necessary to insure that growing timber in the Sumter National Forest can best be utilized

"Whereas Sumter National Forest in South Carolina contains 341,194 acres of growing timber; and

"Whereas to best utilize this bountiful supply of timber, it is necessary that the forest be cruised, thinned, identified, and marked so that it can be selectively marketed; and

"Whereas the Forestry Service has insufficient personnel to survey the timber and recommend the selective cutting, and as a result the forest now has a heavy undergrowth of young timber which, to insure the maximum benefits from this natural resource, should be thinned; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, has advised that with the employment of 7 additional foresters for a period of 3 years this national forest could be properly surveyed and the maximum benefit realized, but the same cannot be accomplished because of lack of funds to employ such personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to make available an appropriation in an amount sufficient to enable the United States Department of Agriculture, Forestry Service, to employ 7 skilled foresters for a period of 3 years, to cruise, mark, cut, and scientifically market timber now growing in the Sumter National Forest, located in the State of South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the two Members of the United States Senate and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Carolina, and to the clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK ON LOOK-OUT MOUNTAIN, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution, signed by the mayor, which was adopted by the City Council of Virginia, Minn. The resolution requests that the Senators and Representatives representing Minnesota join in the introduction of proposed legislation to establish a national park at Look-Out Mountain, north of Virginia, Minn. At a later date I shall introduce appropriate proposed legislation embodying the establishment of such a national park.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting our Congressman and Senators to establish a national park on Look-Out Mountain north of Virginia, Minn.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas the city of Virginia and the surrounding communities have long desired to secure for this area a suitable monument to commemorate the important function the Mesabi Range has played in the development of this country; and

Whereas Look-Out Mountain situated north of Virginia on the Laurentian Divide and in the heart of the Mesabi Range is a suitable and proper place to erect such a memorial of such a nature that it could develop a year around recreational center; and

Whereas Duane Bryers, a recognized artist, formerly of the city of Virginia, has created a statue of the "Mesabi" which properly commemorates the importance of the Mesabi Range has played in the history and development of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of Virginia request the appropriate department of our Federal Government to establish a national park as outlined and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman BLATNIK and Senators HUMPHREY and THYE.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 340. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Bertolani (Gino Mancini); and
S. 341. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 342. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.;
S. 343. A bill for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza;
S. 344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Summers (nee Gebauer); and
S. 345. A bill for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 347. A bill for the relief of Babusaheb Aminsaheb Kamadoli;
S. 348. A bill for the relief of Charalampos Socrates Iossifoglu, Nora Iossifoglu, Helen Iossifoglu, and Efrossini Iossifoglu; and

S. 349. A bill for the relief of Aron Klein and Zita Klein (nee Spielman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 350. A bill for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig;

S. 351. A bill for the relief of Ellen Henriette Buch;

S. 352. A bill for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru;

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka; and

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Xaralampos Giannoulas, also known as Harry Noulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 355. A bill to permit accelerated amortization for Federal income-tax purposes of

facilities constructed to relieve unemployment; and

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Theodore E. Straus; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 357. A bill for the relief of Demetrios A. Mitropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Domenico Bompiani;

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino;

S. 360. A bill for the relief of Ralph Piccolo (Raffaele Piccolo); and

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Lothar G. Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 362. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 363. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; and

S. 364. A bill to amend the first section of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia and his wife Gabriella Buia and their minor daughter Daniella Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Bart Krijger; and

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Maria Stela Leitao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 368. A bill for the relief of Marcelina Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Elena Spacapan; and

S. 370. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hellen M. Sargent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Hamel and certain dependents of the late Michael P. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 372. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to the widowers of female employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 373. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws;

S. 374. A bill to provide for extension, and suspension in certain cases, of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ionna Katyll; and

S. 376. A bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JENNER when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 377. A bill for the relief of Jose Correia Dos Santos;

S. 378. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Gerassimo Trolanos; and

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Mario Renato Talin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 381. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 382. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; and

S. 383. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. 384. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, and Reynaldo Gubbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Micele Pizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 386. A bill for the relief of George J. MacMullin;

S. 387. A bill for the relief of George J. Athanassopoulos;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Petre and Liubitza Ionescu;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Sergio I. Veira; and

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Umberto Marandola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 391. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 392. A bill to consolidate and make uniform the laws relating to public assistance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Chieki Suzuki;

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa;

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Carmen S. N. Cabrera;

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim; and

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnoli Pancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 399. A bill to provide that the Governor and the secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory;

S. 400. A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical metals, minerals, and materials in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 401. A bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; and

S. 402. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory; for the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of the Territory; and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 403. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and

incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 404. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 405. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 406. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 408. A bill to amend section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain veterans not now eligible for a direct housing loan may obtain such a loan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Inge Krarup; S. 410. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Beri Denovi; and

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 413. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 414. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders;

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Pearl O. Sellaz;

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball;

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Eli E. Hood;

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters;

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Jose Alvarez; and

S. 422. A bill for the relief of William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 423. A bill for the relief of Paul Burkhardt; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 424. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain national forest land to Coconino County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Ballora;

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Nickolay Alexievich Semenov;

S. 427. A bill for the relief of Geo. D. Emery Co.;

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Young Bae Kim and his wife Susie H. Kim;

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Klaus W. Jonas and his wife Ilse Borkow Jonas;

S. 432. A bill for the relief of Aniceto Spagnola; and

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Markos Demetrius Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 434. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 435. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota and the transfer of certain lands to such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Petrielli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 437. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to establish a presumption of service connection for progressive muscular atrophy becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill;

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Lucy Peronius; and

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Nicos Nicholas Mouratides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 441. A bill to provide that the basic salaries of officers and members of the police force for the Washington National Airport shall be the same as the basic salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; and

S. 442. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 443. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 444. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 445. A bill to amend section 1701, title 18, United States Code;

S. 446. A bill to amend chapter 13, title 18, United States Code, to prevent the use of the mails or instrumentalities of commerce for the dissemination of libelous matter, and for other purposes;

S. 447. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the

disqualification of a judge for bias or prejudice;

S. 448. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or any judge thereof, to issue writs of habeas corpus with respect to persons held in the reformatory at Lorton or the workhouse at Occoquan, both in the State of Virginia, for criminal offenses committed in the District of Columbia; and

S. 449. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 450. A bill to establish Admiralty Island National Park in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 451. A bill to provide for the investigation of the practicability of constructing a new section of the Alaska Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 452. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 453. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and treatment of members of the Coast Guard and their dependents in hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (by request):

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Henry Hauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 455. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 456. A bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 457. A bill to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last-named bill above, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 458. A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

S. 459. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; and

S. 460. A bill to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for Mr. KILGORE):

S. 462. A bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 463. A bill to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies

of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DUFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):
S. 464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford;

S. 466. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Gafos and Adamantios George Gafos;

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Marie T. Gonsalves;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Whitman;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Aina Brizga;

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Lee In Ja;

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family;

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 475. A bill for the relief of Margaret R. Zimmerman;

S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Aldo Timossi; and

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 479. A bill to require safety-closing devices on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 480. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning the last Monday in June of each year as See America First Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANS-

FIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KERR, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to state explicitly the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PENALTY FOR IMPORTATION OR SHIPMENT IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF CERTAIN GOODS PRODUCED BY SLAVE LABOR

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me made in the Senate on June 18, 1954, relating to this matter, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 376) making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3632) making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor, introduced by Mr. Jenner (for himself, Mr. McCarran, and Mr. Welker), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"A bill making it a felony to import or ship in interstate commerce any commodity or goods produced by slave labor

"Be it enacted, etc., That, from and after the effective date of this act, it shall be unlawful to import into the United States or to ship in interstate commerce in the United States any commodity or goods produced by slave labor.

"Sec. 2. Any person who shall violate this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or both."

The statement by Senator JENNER is as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

"In the recent past, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, I appointed a task force for the purpose of maintaining a continuing study and investigation of the strategy and tactics of world communism. This task force, which consists of myself as chairman, with Senators HERMAN WELKER and Pat McCarran as members, has been conducting a series of hearings on this general subject because we know that to adequately appraise the operation of the Communist conspiracy in this Nation it is essential that we keep abreast of the world strategy and tactics of international communism.

"In the hearings which we have thus far conducted one of the principal subjects which has been under consideration is the worldwide trade offensive of the Kremlin which has as its ultimate goal economic strangulation of the West through ruinous competition of the products of slave labor. This threat presents to us not only the issue of protecting the American workingman in his job, but it also presents a moral issue of the highest order. Every shipload of goods produced by slave labor in Iron Curtain countries which we import into this country merely whets the appetite of the Kremlin for greater numbers to be subjected to this inhuman exploitation.

"Accordingly, the bill (S. 3632) has been patterned after our laws which prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of goods produced by child labor. If those laws are right, then this bill is right. If it is right to protect the American workingman from ruinous competition by slave labor then this bill is right. If it is right to protect ourselves and the free world from the spreading menace of international communism then this bill is right."

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK, AND NEW JERSEY COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives because of hurricane winds and tides.

In order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in this connection be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be followed by the printing of excerpts and tables from a report prepared by Army engineers on the question of the hurricanes. I ask that the bill be first printed, then the statement by myself, and then the statement by the Army engineers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, excerpts, and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible

means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the severe damages to the coastal and tidal areas of the northeastern seaboard of the United States resulting from the hurricanes of August 31, 1954, and September 11, 1954, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, and the economics thereof, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement by Senator BUSH and the excerpts and tables from a report prepared by the Army engineers are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The damages caused by hurricanes have imposed financial burdens on thousands of families in the coastal areas of Connecticut and other States. Damages to Government installations and private facilities have been great. Preliminary estimates furnished to me by the Army engineers place the economic loss in New England due to hurricanes Carol and Edna in 1954 at approximately \$240 million.

In recent years, four hurricanes have ravaged the coast of Connecticut and other States in the Northeast. The hurricane of 1938 was the first to strike this area in many years. The recurrence of these terrible storms, once in 1944 and twice last year, indicates the strong possibility of a change in weather patterns which may bring them with increasing frequency in the years to come.

A survey to determine methods of controlling beach erosion was authorized in 1946. Based on studies made by the Corps of Army Engineers under this authorization, legislation permitting Federal participation in beach-erosion-control projects in Connecticut and other States was adopted by the 83d Congress last year. In the present session, we are seeking appropriations to cover the Federal Government's share of the cost.

The hurricanes of 1954 aggravated the beach-erosion problem in some areas. This, however, is only one of the problems arising from hurricanes. Protective works against tidal flooding are needed at some parts of the coast. Repairs to damaged breakwaters and other aids to navigation are essential.

The cost of protective works is beyond the capacity of local and State governments to bear alone. This is a case where the assistance of the Federal Government, on a partnership basis with towns and cities, is desirable and essential.

It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will schedule this bill for early hearing.

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT PREPARED BY ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE HURRICANES

The storm of August 31 caused by far greater destruction in the New England area than the storm of September 11, although the latter received greater publicity as it approached the New England Coast. The August hurricane, designated "Carol," moving in the north-northeasterly direction from Cape Hatteras, crossed over the easterly end of Long Island and entered into the New

England area at the south shore of Rhode Island. The September hurricane, designated "Edna," moving in a north-northeasterly direction from offshore of Cape Hatteras, approached New England on a course somewhat easterly of the preceding storm and entered New England in the vicinity of Marthas Vineyard. The course of Carol extended across Rhode Island, eastern Massachusetts, and along the Maine-New Hampshire border into Canada through the St. Lawrence Valley. The course of Edna extended across Cape Cod, the Gulf of Maine to the vicinity of Eastport, Maine, and thence through New Brunswick, Canada. The northeasterly movement of Carol accelerated from 12 to 40 miles an hour as it approached New England, whereas the acceleration of Edna increased up to 35 miles an hour as it traversed the New England coast. Hurricane Carol struck the Rhode Island area in full strength at approximately 10:30 a. m. (eastern standard time) with sustained winds up to 90 miles per hour and gusts up to 105 miles per hour. The eastern Massachusetts coastal area received the full impact of the storm at approximately 11:30 a. m. (eastern standard time) when winds at 86 miles per hour were recorded at weather bureau station at Logan Airport, with gusts up to 100 miles per hour. Heavy rains accompanied the storm, 2.60 inches being recorded at both Boston and Providence. With rapidly diminishing effect, the storm moved northward into Maine and New Hampshire. Hurricane Edna passed over southeastern New England in the early afternoon of September 11, 1954, the center moving over Marthas Vineyard. Winds of 73 miles per hour were recorded, with gusts up to 90 miles per hour. Boston and Portland, both lying westerly of the storm's center, were buffeted with winds up to 48 and 60 miles per hour respectively, and gusts up to 78 and 74 miles per hour. Precipitation over the entire coastal area was torrential, with Providence reporting 4.37 inches, Boston 5.64 inches, and Portland 7.49 inches. Most of the damage resulting from the storm was due to flooded streams in the island areas. The storm moved into New Brunswick, Canada, leaving relatively minor damage along the New England coast.

COASTAL FLOODING AND WAVE PRODUCTS EFFECT OF THE HURRICANES

The chance circumstance of the normal high water coinciding with the full easterly intensity of the hurricane's strength, as the storm of August 31 struck the southern New England coast and Massachusetts Bay area, resulted in abnormally high tides and destructive wave action. In comparison, the September storm, with winds of somewhat lesser intensity offshore and with the time of high tide generally at considerable variance with the maximum velocity of the storm, produced relatively minor flooding and wave action.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF COASTAL DAMAGE, HURRICANE CAROL

(a) Connecticut: Damage resulting from flooding caused by extreme high water at low shore areas was general along the coast. Damage from wave attack was noted between New Haven and Old Saybrook, but was particularly severe east of the Connecticut River, increasing in severity toward the Rhode Island boundary, with greatest damage at New London (\$1 million) and Stonington (\$5 million). Erosion of beaches and destruction of seawalls and other shore protective structures were not generally severe. At some locations quantities of sand were washed landward from low beaches. At several locations beaches appeared to have benefited by accretion. The greater part of all losses throughout the State resulted from floodwater and wind damage to industrial plants, business establishments, shore-front homes and cottages, and east of the Connecticut River damage to fishing and pleas-

ure craft, harbor facilities, destruction of shore-front homes and cottages and beach establishments. Detailed estimate of losses at only a few locations was available.

(b) Rhode Island: Heavy damages from tidal flooding and wave attack occurred throughout the coastal area, with some beach developments almost completely wiped out. Hundreds of summer homes west of Point Judith were destroyed on their foundations or were swept off the low barrier beaches. Cliffs and dunes out of reach of ordinary wave action were eroded, and numerous breaches through the shore barriers were cut by the floodwater runoff from the ponds behind the barrier beach. All natural beach grass protection was completely destroyed. Damage to seawalls, groins, and other shore protective structures was comparatively moderate, many such structures being overtopped by the extreme high tides with consequent destruction of property which they were intended to protect. Damage or total loss to boats, piers, wharves, and shore-front buildings were widespread. Water damage in the business section of the city of Providence caused by tidal flooding during Carol was extremely heavy.

(c) Massachusetts: South shore and islands off the coast. Damage from flooding and wave attack occurred throughout the entire area. Heavy damage to beaches and shore developments was limited largely to the area between Westport and Wareham, Falmouth, and Hyannis, and on the island of Marthas Vineyard. Erosion of beaches and destruction or damage to shore protective structures were comparatively moderate. Heavy wave attack occurred generally at a higher level than the berms of beaches, eroding bluffs and cliffs, and sand dunes. Destruction and damage to all types of vessels were heavy and widespread, occurring at practically all harbor areas.

East shore: Waterfront damage north of Cape Cod was caused principally by wave attack and exceptionally high water which resulted in heavy damage to small craft ranging from skiffs to expensive yachts. A large number of pleasure boats were sunk or blown ashore, with resulting destruction. Erosion of beaches and damage to shore protective structures were comparatively moderate.

(d) New Hampshire: The principal losses along the coastal area resulted from destruction of or damage to small craft and flooding of beach areas. No serious erosion of beaches or destruction of shore protective structure was reported.

(e) Maine: The principal losses along the coastal area resulted from destruction and damage to fishing and pleasure craft and fishing gear, and from flooding of low beach developments. Pleasure craft damage was reported at Portland, Camden, Casco Bay, and Lake Sebago. Seawall washouts were reported at Wells Beach.

COASTAL DAMAGE, HURRICANE EDNA—NEW ENGLAND—GENERAL

Damage along the entire coast during hurricane Edna was comparatively moderate. The heaviest losses occurred as a result of flooding brought on by exceptionally heavy rainfall, overflowing culverts and flooded streets, with several minor washouts.

Recapitulation of damage caused by hurricanes Carol and Edna

Damage to Federal structures and channels.....	\$1,215,000
Damage to vessels (commercial and pleasure).....	12,455,000
Damage to shore properties (public and private).....	151,656,000
Loss of life.....	58

Additional damage, in the estimated amount of \$74,114,000, was incurred by public works and public and private utilities. Segregation between coastal and inland damage is difficult in these cases, but by far the major portion of damage occurred in coastal areas.

Damage to Government structures and installations, hurricanes Carol and Edna¹

	Structure	Cost to repair	Channel shoaling	Cost
Connecticut:				
Southport	Breakwater	\$50,000	Entrance channel	\$25,000
Bridgeport	Fayerweather breakwater	75,000		
Milford	East jetty	35,000	Entrance channel	30,000
Clinton			Channel and anchorage	50,000
Duck Island	Breakwater	35,000		
Saybrook	do	25,000	Channel, outer bar	25,000
Stonington	do	50,000		
Total		270,000		130,000
Rhode Island:				
Point Judith	West breakwater	10,000	Channel	50,000
	Main breakwater	150,000		
	East breakwater	250,000		
Block Island:				
Harbor of Refuge	Main breakwater	10,000	Entrance channel	50,000
Great Salt Pond	South jetty	10,000		
Total		430,000		100,000
Massachusetts:				
Menemsha Creek	West jetty	15,000	Channel	50,000
	East jetty	10,000		
Edgartown Harbor	Breakwater	50,000	Channel	50,000
Hyannis Harbor	do	25,000		
Provincetown Harbor	do	25,000		
Boston Harbor, Deer Island	Seawall	40,000		
Total		140,000		100,000
Maine:				
Kennebunk River	Breakwater	5,000		
Isle of Shoals	do	10,000		
Total		15,000		
Grand total		855,000		330,000

¹ Damage to Government structures in New England coastal area is negligible from storm of Sept. 11.

NOTE.—Damage to Coast Guard facilities and installations, most of which were on shore, is estimated to be \$896,050. This damage was caused mostly by hurricane Carol, in the amount of \$791,900. Damage to Navy installations is estimated at \$3,858,300.

Boat losses, hurricanes Carol and Edna¹

Location	Type (pleasure)			Type (commercial)		
	Wrecked	Damaged	Value	Wrecked	Damaged	Value
Connecticut	65	395	\$1,000,000	10	35	\$390,000
Rhode Island	400	1,365	5,000,000	50	200	650,000
Massachusetts	240	990	3,000,000	25	100	1,000,000
Maine	40	270	750,000	50	100	450,000
New Hampshire	10	45	150,000	5	20	65,000
Total	755	3,065	9,900,000	140	455	2,555,000

¹ The major part of listed damage is chargeable to Carol. Not listed above is damage to Coast Guard vessels in the area. A cutter, lightship, and 2 buoy tenders were damaged in the August storm, in the amount of approximately \$150,000. In the September storm, 1 cutter received damages of about \$60,000.

Shore damage
HURRICANE CAROL

Location	Commercial	Industrial	Private and personal property damage
Connecticut	\$2,910,000	\$5,339,000	\$13,242,000
Rhode Island	44,934,000	13,938,000	13,913,000
Massachusetts	5,063,000	17,281,000	23,015,000
New Hampshire	280,000	99,000	954,000
Maine	317,000	32,000	580,000
Total	53,504,000	36,689,000	51,704,000

HURRICANE EDNA

Location	Commercial	Industrial	Private and personal property damage
Connecticut	\$489,000	\$205,000	\$2,687,000
Rhode Island	941,000	591,000	1,616,000
Massachusetts	539,000	867,000	1,343,000
New Hampshire	197,000	21,000	22,000
Maine	197,000	24,000	217,000
Total	2,166,000	1,708,000	5,885,000

NOTE.—Estimated damage to public works (not including Federal installations) and cleanup attendant upon such damage in New England, most of which occurred in the coastal area, is \$42,738,000 for Carol and \$8,105,000 for Edna. Estimated damage to railroad transportation facilities in New England is \$1,153,000 for Carol and \$837,000 for Edna. Estimated damage to utilities in New England, exclusive of damage suffered by several large private powerplants and transmission lines, is \$11,711,000 for Carol and \$9,565,000 for Edna.

CI—22

sidered along with other proposals having a similar purpose, which may come before the Senate. The health needs of the Nation can be met realistically within the framework of our free institutions without resorting to Government intervention and control.

The cornerstone of the national health-insurance program advocated in this bill is the local, voluntary, prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Unfortunately their cost is beyond the means of a large segment of the population. The increasing popularity of these plans, however, demonstrates that the voluntary approach to the exigencies imposed by ill health is the solution desired by the majority of the people if it is designed in consideration of their financial resources.

The voluntary health and medical service program embodied in this bill basically is financial assistance to voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment health plans.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services is placed in the States and local communities, with the fullest encouragement to local initiative. The people are thus offered the maximum in assistance with the minimum of governmental interference.

By this proposed legislation the health problems of the Nation are met in terms of presently available services, while the necessary incentives are provided for additional medical facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a résumé of the bill I am introducing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the résumé will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ives (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The résumé presented by Mr. Ives is as follows:

RESUMÉ OF NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1955

The proposed National Health Act of 1955 would amend the already existing Public Health Service Act by (a) adding a new title VII which provides an immediate health and medical service program; (b) adding a new title VIII which provides for a long-range survey of national health needs; (c) expanding existing provisions for hospital construction and adding new provisions for aid to medical and nursing schools; and (d) adding provisions for local public health units.

NEW VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to provide immediate assistance so as (1) to enable voluntary prepayment health service plans to make their services generally available in the communities which they serve at charges based on the income of the subscribers; (2) to encourage the establishment of local administrative facilities embracing functional health service regions and districts in order to facilitate the effectuation

NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, among other purposes, will facilitate the broader distribution of health services and increase the quantity and improve the quality of such services and facilities. If enacted, this bill will be called the National Health Act of 1955. It will provide a voluntary program of health insurance in response to the health needs of the people of this country.

This is essentially the same bill which the junior Senator from Vermont and I introduced in the 81st and the 83d Congresses. The junior Senator from New Jersey also introduced similar proposed legislation in the 81st Congress when he was then serving as a Member of the House of Representatives. We are reintroducing it in modified form in the belief that it is designed to provide adequate health care in a manner consistent with our country's tradition of freedom, and that it should be seriously con-

of present and future health programs; (3) to enable nonprofit hospitals and medical and nursing schools to maintain and improve their services and facilities; and (4) to assist voluntary prepayment health service plans to construct and equip personal health-service centers.

The key to the new health and medical program is the local voluntary prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Both new and existing plans, to qualify for Federal-State aid, would be required to base their rates of payment by subscribers upon a percentage of the subscribers' adjusted gross income (up to \$5,000); and under each plan a majority of the board of directors must be laymen.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services would be placed in the States and local communities. In order to participate in the program, each State would set up a State health council. This council would divide the State into several regions, a number of which have already been established under the Federal Hospital Construction Act. Each region would be managed by a health region authority, composed of laymen appointed by the Governor.

Individuals would obtain medical care for themselves and their families by voluntarily subscribing to a cooperating, voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment health plan. Membership would be in a group plan or on an individual basis—with the health region authority determining the number of non-group applicants the plans can accept. Further provision would be made regarding the limit on the number of out-of-State beneficiaries a plan might include.

A national yardstick in the form of a comprehensive range of benefits would be established. The cost for this particular coverage would be estimated by the health region authorities for each health region. The subscription charge for this range of benefits could not be less than 3 percent of the subscriber's income under \$5,000. Plans could offer more or less comprehensive benefits than those contained in the national yardstick and as the range of benefits offered might vary, so the rates would be required to vary from the 3-percent minimum for national-yardstick benefits. The State, through the State health council, would determine the maximum range of services all the plans in the State might offer. The minimum charge for participation in a plan would be \$6 a year.

FEDERAL-STATE AID TO LOCAL PLANS

The States would be able to expend funds, a percentage of which would be reimbursable by the Federal Government, for payments to voluntary plans to meet any deficit between the aggregate of income from subscription charges and the allowed cost calculated by each health region authority, as the normal cost of supplying benefits under each approved contract.

The basic formula for Federal aid under this bill would follow the lines of the Hospital Construction Act. Federal aid would be granted a State in inverse proportion to its per capita income. States qualifying for the maximum percentage would receive Federal aid at a ratio of 3 Federal dollars for every State dollar devoted to the program; those with the highest per capita income, subject to the minimum percentage, would get 1 Federal dollar for 2 State dollars. The amount of Federal aid could not exceed \$15 a year for each person covered under health plans in the respective States.

A State would begin to receive its Federal contribution as soon as it passed the appropriate legislation and the required machinery was in operation.

When financial help might be needed for the inception of a qualified nonprofit plan, the Federal Government would also help. Provision would be made for State noninter-

est-bearing loans, reimbursable under the Federal percentage, to match funds provided for the establishment of a plan from private contributions or noninterest-bearing loans.

LONG-RANGE SURVEY OF NATIONAL HEALTH NEEDS

A bipartisan commission to be known as the Federal Health Study and Planning Commission would be created under this act. This Commission, to be appointed jointly by the Congress and the President, would direct, supervise, and coordinate continuing health studies with respect to the most pressing problems, such as the financial condition of the country's hospitals, the recruitment and training of health personnel, the provision for care for the chronic diseases (heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, and other crippling diseases of children, etc.), and provision for dental care. The Commission would utilize the research facilities of existing governmental agencies and other organizations as far as practicable.

The Commission would be instructed to formulate and submit to the President and to the Congress within a period of 4 years a 20-year national health program. Provision would be made for interim reports to the President and to the Congress pending submission of its findings and program. In formulating this long-range plan the Commission would be required to take into account the recommendations of the cooperating local and national organizations. Thereafter the Commission would submit, every 2 years, further plans, on a 20-year basis, designed constantly to improve the Nation's health services.

HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The present hospital-construction program would be modified to permit State grants and Federal contributions for the construction of personal health service centers, serving ambulatory patients—as well as hospitals, diagnostic centers, rehabilitation centers, and public health centers. The appropriation authorization under this program would be increased \$25 million.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND NURSING SCHOOLS

The act would provide assistance in maintaining and increasing the number of individuals trained annually in the fields of medicine and nursing.

Payments to medical schools of \$500 for each enrolled student, plus an additional \$1,000 for each enrolled student in excess of average past enrollment would be authorized. Comparable provisions would be provided for nursing schools.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to grant up to 50 percent of the costs of construction and equipment of new medical or nursing schools or expansions of existing schools.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

The act would make provision for assistance to States for the development and maintenance of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the Nation and for the training of all types of personnel for public health unit work.

If a State were to provide a plan for extending the coverage and services of local public health units, it would be entitled to receive a percentage of the expenditures under the plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's per capita income, but not exceeding 66⅔ percent.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

At present, a farmer who exceeds his acreage allotment for wheat and corn is prohibited from receiving financial reimbursement for work he has done on the soil-conservation program.

In the interest of maintaining good, sound soil-conservation practices, I believe these programs should not be made contingent upon each other. The proposed legislation would serve the purpose of separating the programs, so that farmers would continue to receive encouragement, both financial and technical, for their soil-conservation efforts.

This is a companion bill to a similar measure introduced in the House by Congressman LOVRE, of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that a pamphlet by Edmund Pendleton, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar Association, entitled "Barter—A New Approach to Government Procurement" be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 443) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The pamphlet presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

BARTER—A NEW APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

(By Edmund Pendleton, Jr., of the District of Columbia Bar)

"The United States Government today sits atop the greatest hoard of food and fiber in the world's history. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the holder of investments totaling more than \$6 billion, made up of commodities and commodity loans. And it is a flourishing corporation, if continuing growth of investment is used as our criterion. Before this fiscal year is over, total CCC commitments are expected to become substantially higher than \$6 billion—probably well over \$7 billion and possibly past 8 billion."

The American farmer today is well aware of the problem created by the tremendous commodity holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He realizes the depressing effect on prices which the stocks produce. He may not be so conscious of the cost of this program to the American taxpayer. Every day the Commodity Credit Corporation pays out \$70,000 to store the agricultural commodities which it has acquired by purchase or loan.

The 83d Congress recognized the mounting problem created by the price-support program. On July 10, 1954, the President signed into law the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress. The Congress set forth in this act three programs for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.¹

¹ Barter: To traffic or trade by direct exchange of one commodity for another. Webster.

² Address by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at 41st National Foreign Trade Convention, National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York City, N. Y., Nov. 16, 1954.

³ Not all the commodity holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation are classified as "surplus." For the purposes of some of its programs, the Secretary of Agriculture has so designated only certain dairy products, including dried milk and butter. Throughout this article, however, the expression "surplus commodities" will include all of the various holdings of the CCC, since that is the popular understanding of the expression.

(a) Title I authorizes sales for foreign currencies. Such sales may not exceed \$700 million over a period of 3 years. A government-to-government agreement is a prerequisite to commercial sales. The petitioning country must establish the commodities moving under such agreement will be over and above usual purchases from the United States. This program is patterned on the Foreign Operations Administration program authorized by section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953—Public Law 118, 83d Congress.

(b) Title II authorizes the President to make grants in the form of agricultural commodities for famine relief to friendly foreign peoples. This program is limited to \$300 million over a period of 3 years and is based on government-to-government negotiations.

(c) Title III strengthens the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to enter into barter transactions.⁴ Barter is the only one of these programs which involves tangible acquisitions by the Federal Government as quid pro quo payment for agricultural commodities.⁵ The barter program is unique in today's pattern of Federal Government procurement.

The Congress and the administration are relying on the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a substantial effort to rid itself of its surplus stocks through the barter program. CCC apparently is doing so. Recently Secretary of Agriculture Benson stated that "as much as \$105 million worth of surplus farm products now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories will be bartered during the next few months for foreign-produced strategic and other materials."⁶

For the first time many businessmen wishing to sell to the American Government are becoming aware of the barter program. In spite of the tremendous complexities involved in barter many grain firms are seeking to participate in the program in order to obtain agricultural commodities from CCC on a barter basis.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Prior to July 10, 1954, when the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 came into effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation was operating a barter program. It was procuring strategic materials

⁴Title III places the barter authority in the Secretary of Agriculture and the CCC. Thus there is some confusion as to the meaning of par. 6 of a letter of the President of September 9, 1954, in which he requests "... the Secretary of Commerce to provide the focal point in the Government for assisting private enterprise with respect to barter transactions referred to in the act."

⁵Other commodity disposal programs, not involving barter include:

(1) Offshore procurement: Sec. 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, Public Law 665 of the 83d Cong., authorizes \$350 million to finance normal purchases of agricultural commodities in the United States. In addition the Congress continued available \$55 million of unobligated balances to be used for assistance to Spain in the form of agricultural commodities. Sec. 122 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 provided \$35 million worth of agricultural commodities to pay for the manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft.

(2) Surplus dairy products: Sec. 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431) as amended by sec. 302 of Public Law 480, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to donate for overseas relief commodities in danger of spoiling. This program has operated almost exclusively in the disposal of dairy products. The section authorizes other agencies than the Department of Agriculture to barter with commodities furnished by the Department. This authority has never been utilized.

⁶USDA Press Release 2776-54, Oct. 27, 1954.

for the stockpile and nonstrategic materials for the foreign assistance programs of the United States. The basic authority for the operation of these programs is found in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U. S. C. 714 b and c). Section 4 (h) of the Charter Act authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to barter for strategic materials:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation. Insofar as practicable, in effecting such exchange of goods, normal commercial trade channels shall be utilized and priority shall be given to commodities easily storable and those which serve as prime incentive goods to stimulate production of critical and strategic materials. * * * Nothing contained herein shall limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire, hold, or dispose of such quantity of strategic and critical materials as it deems advisable in carrying out its functions and protecting its assets."

Section 5 (f) of the Charter Act authorizes the CCC to procure nonstrategic materials:

"In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act, the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities."

Under the authorities cited above the CCC disposed of approximately \$121 million worth of agricultural commodities from March 10, 1950 (the time of the first barter contract) through September 30, 1954.⁷ Strategic materials acquired included extra long staple cotton, industrial diamonds, chromite, waterfowl down, and mercury; nonstrategic, fertilizers and blankets. Very little business was done between July 10 (effective date of the new act) and September 30, 1954, pending action of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Board of Directors of CCC to implement title III of Public Law 480.

If the CCC already had the authority to barter, why did the Congress include a section on barter in the new law? The reasoning of the legislators in enacting section 303 of Public Law 480 (dealing with the barter authority) is best summarized in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture accompanying the bill which was adopted.⁸

"Although barter of surplus agricultural commodities for critical and strategic materials is specifically contemplated and authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Department of Agriculture has participated in relatively few such transactions and, apparently, had taken an attitude discouraging, rather than encouraging, the making of such exchanges."

Section 303 of Public Law 480 was not intended to replace the barter authority contained in the Charter Act of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It amounted rather to a restatement of legislative intent. It is a clear statement of the authority which the Secretary of Agriculture now has to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities through barter for either strategic materials or economic assistance or other items. Section 303 of Public Law 480 reads in part as follows: "Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that, in addition to other authorized

methods and means of disposing of agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, there may be opportunity to protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation by barter or exchange of such agricultural commodities for (a) strategic materials entailing less risk of loss through deterioration or substantially less storage charges, or (b) materials, goods, or equipment required in connection with foreign economic and military aid and assistance programs, or (c) materials or equipment required in substantial quantities for offshore construction programs, he is hereby directed to use every practicable means, in cooperation with other Government agencies, to arrange and make, through private trade channels, such barter or exchanges or to utilize the authority conferred on him by section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, to make such barter or exchanges. Agencies of the United States Government procuring such materials, goods, or equipment are hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities by means of barter or exchange."

EFFECT ON BARTER AUTHORITY OF SECTION 303, PUBLIC LAW 480

Even though this section did not change substantially the barter authority of the CCC, it is an important statement of legislative intent. Viewed in light of the report of the House Agriculture Committee, cited earlier, the following directives emerge:

1. The CCC is encouraged to protect its assets by action—inaction is not favored.⁹

"Among other deterrents to an effective barter program, the Department has maintained the policy of declining to accept in trade for its agricultural surplus any strategic materials that it did not have an immediate sale for to the appropriate Government agency. While not criticizing the Department for this attitude (since there was no legislative policy statement to guide it) the committee believes that the funds and assets of the CCC can be much better protected by exchanging, when the opportunity offers, some of its costly to store agricultural surplus for nondeteriorating, easily stored strategic materials, even though these may have to be held for some time as the property of the CCC. Indeed, to refuse to make such exchanges simply because no Government agency is in a position at the moment to buy the strategic materials from the CCC, is to negate the very reason for barter—which is an exchange of materials for materials when money with which to purchase such materials is unavailable or is less useful than materials."

2. The authority of the CCC to barter for its own account (i. e., the strategic materials acquired becoming assets of the Corporation) is reemphasized.¹⁰

3. Section 303 specifically included all of the foreign military and economic aid procurement as appropriate areas for barter programs.

4. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to use every practicable means to arrange barter.

5. Other Federal Government agencies are directed to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture in the extension of the barter procurement procedure.

WHAT IS A BARTER CONTRACT?

The discussion throughout this article deals with barter or exchange contracts

⁷Pp. 10 and 11, H. Rept. No. 1766.

⁸Section 303 of Public Law 480.

"Strategic materials so acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be considered as assets of the Corporation and other agencies of the Government in purchasing strategic materials, shall purchase such materials from Commodity Credit Corporation inventories to the extent available in fulfillment of their requirements."

⁹USDA press release 2681-54, Oct. 20, 1954.

¹⁰P. 10 H. Rept. No. 1766 83d Cong., 2d sess., to accompany S. 2475.

where the CCC is one party. Businessmen have engaged for a number of years, perhaps centuries, in barter contracts whose terms may or may not resemble those now being written by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The fundamentals of these CCC barter contracts may be summarized: (1) the contractor undertakes (posting stringent performance guaranties) to supply material for the national stockpile or for some foreign aid program; (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation undertakes to pay for this material in the form of available agricultural commodities;¹¹ (3) the Contractor undertakes (again with guaranties) to export the agricultural commodities to friendly foreign countries.

NEGOTIATING A BARTER CONTRACT

Most businessmen and attorneys who have participated in cash procurement programs of the Federal Government are aware of the procedures employed. They will know that purchases can be negotiated or competitive. It may be interesting to review the pattern of CCC procedure, which falls within the category of negotiated contracting. Since the steps involved are slightly different, where CCC is procuring strategic materials, from those in the case of non-strategic materials, the two procedures will be viewed separately.

Procurement of strategic materials: At the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation is procuring strategic materials for the national stockpile on the basis of an Office of Defense Mobilization release of September 21, 1954.¹² This release specifies which strategic materials will be considered for procurement by barter.¹³ Any contractor

who wishes to supply one of these materials through a barter contract must make a firm offer to the CCC. Offers subject to confirmation are not considered. The material must meet national stockpile specifications. It must be from a non-Communist source. The quantity which he offers must not exceed the stockpile objective (a classified figure), although he will have no way of knowing how much of this objective remains unfilled.

Upon receiving his offer the officials of the CCC review it with the liaison office of the General Services Administration. This latter agency is the authority designated by the Office of Defense Mobilization to procure strategic materials for cash. If the offer is rejected, the CCC officials may indicate that the price is too high, that ODM/CCC have decided against buying at that moment, or some condition has not been fulfilled in the proposal. No further indication of an acceptable price is given. If the offer is accepted, it is accepted conditionally, subject to the negotiation of terms of the barter contract.

Following such acceptance the negotiation of a contract may take several weeks. Involved are clearances with various offices of the Department including fiscal, legal, and commodity offices. The contractor soon learns that the execution and implementation of the barter contract with its double aspect of financing and moving commodities in two directions is twice as complicated and risky as the normal cash contract with the American Government.

Procurement of nonstrategic materials: The CCC program for the procurement of nonstrategic materials is much smaller in dollar volume. To the present time it has not been developed to the same extent as has the program for strategic materials and, it seems, not to its full potential. Fundamental in the difference is the support given the barter program for strategic materials by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Government agencies involved in non-strategic procurements have found it harder to overcome established cash-purchasing procedures.¹⁴

The first step in the procurement of these materials generally comes with the solicitation of bids by the procuring agencies. Based on the terms and conditions of the invitation, offers are received by CCC from private United States firms who desire to participate on a barter basis. Firm offers must be made to CCC in response to the invitations prior to the closing date. Thereafter CCC translates these offers into offers of its own and files with the buying agency its own proposal to furnish the desired materials on an intragovernmental transfer basis. Thus CCC itself, in effect, appears as a bidder in competitive solicitations of GSA and other procurement agencies. If the bid of CCC is successful, thereafter negotiation of the barter contract for the nonstrategic material follows the same steps as for strategic materials.

OUTLOOK FOR BARTER

There is a tremendous potential involved in the total program which could be developed for barter. It is anticipated that CCC commodity stocks may exceed \$8 billion this year. There is no indication in the near future that the price-support program will be eliminated. The only conclusion which can be drawn is that no real limit to the size of barter procurement exists.

If, as suggested earlier in this article, there is a substantial advantage to the Government and to the taxpayer in the operation of this program, are there and advantages which induce the participation of businessmen as suppliers? At best the operation of the program is complicated and bidding is

highly competitive. What are the conditions under which the contractor operates and what could be done to simplify implementation of congressional intent?

1. The Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration have ruled that certain strategic materials will be acquired only through means of barter and not for cash. In addition, procurement for the supplemental stockpile (sec. 104 (b), Public Law 480) should be authorized on a barter basis.

2. Section 303 of Public Law 480 directs agencies of the United States Government to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in the barter program. So far this preference for barter has been interpreted to permit the award in case of a tie-bid to the firm undertaking to receive payment in agricultural commodities. As a matter of policy this preference should be broadened to an actual percentage or amount based on savings of storage charges and other costs.

3. Contractors entering into barter contracts receive certain facilities and assume certain obligations in acquiring agricultural commodities in addition to those granted cash buyers. The Department of Agriculture must continue to support in all of its aspects the barter program. A way must be found to overcome the inertia created by the tendency to favor established procedures. As a sales program barter must not be undercut by giveaways.

4. In some cases involving the procurement of materials for foreign-assistance programs the barter contractor is able to supply them through a negotiated contract instead of through competitive bidding. In other ways the various procurement agencies must cooperate actually and actively as contemplated by the Congress in Public Law 480.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS ENTERING THE ARMED FORCES PRIOR TO JANUARY 31, 1957

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 444) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until January 31, 1957, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits and to permit certain service performed after January 31, 1957, to be included in computing the period of entitlement to educational benefits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I am introducing today a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, so as to extend the education and training benefits thereof to all persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States

¹¹ Just what commodities are available remains somewhat obscure. Monthly export sales prices lists, showing commodities available for export are issued by the Department of Agriculture. Since these lists apply to cash as well as barter sales, they do not always state the full story. The contractor may or may not be able to obtain a specified agricultural commodity on terms which were in effect at the time he first proposed business with CCC.

¹² The role of ODM is specified in sec. 4 (h) of the CCC Charter Act, 15 U. S. C. 714b, reading in part:

"The determination of the quantities and qualities of such materials which are desirable for stockpiling and the determination of which materials are strategic and critical shall be made (by ODM) in the manner prescribed by section 98a of title 50 (Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act). Strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for agricultural commodities shall, to the extent approved by the Munitions Board of the National Military Establishment, be transferred to the stockpile provided for by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; and when transferred to the stockpile the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the strategic and critical materials so transferred to the stockpile from the funds made available for the purpose of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, in an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the material transferred to the stockpile."

The functions vested in the Munitions Board were transferred to ODM June 12, 1953, by Reorganization Plan No. 3.

¹³ Aluminum; asbestos; amosite; asbestos; chrysotile; bauxite, metallurgical; beryl; chromite, chemical; chromite, metallurgical; chromite, refractory; copper; diamonds, industrial; diamonds, industrial stones; graphite, amorphous lump; graphite, lubricant flake; manganese ore, chemical; mica, block; mica, film; patinum; selenium; talc, steatite block; titanium.

¹⁴ The Corps of Engineers has been the most successful.

prior to the 31st day of January 1957. I would like to explain briefly the factors which have entered into my decision to propose such action.

There is no necessity for me to detail the arguments advanced in this body when the original GI bill was first discussed and then adopted. It will suffice to point out that it was the sense of the Congress that the young men and women who entered the Armed Forces of our country and spent the wartime years in the military service of the United States were making a special contribution to the welfare of this Nation. Other generations had made similar contributions, only to find in many instances that their country seemed unaware, and unappreciative, of the sacrifices of its youth. The Congress determined, during World War II, that a profoundly grateful America should this time express its gratitude to its veterans, and enacted the GI bill of rights to accord many substantial and well-earned benefits to those who had served.

Likewise, in 1952, when hundreds of thousands of young American men and women were once again defending the United States, this time against Communist aggression, Congress wisely decided to extend similar benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean conflict. Public Law 550, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, was enacted in 1952 to accomplish that end, and soon came to be known popularly as the Korean GI bill.

These two laws have materially assisted the veterans of our Armed Forces in their return to civilian life. They have been aided in buying homes, in establishing independent small businesses, in securing attractive and suitable employment. They have benefited in numerous other ways. And, certainly, among the most successful and widely acclaimed provisions of each of these laws were those extending education or training opportunities.

Under the two GI bills, many Americans were enabled to begin or resume their education or training after separation from service. Millions of veterans received college educations, and in frequent instances were able to pursue extensive programs of postgraduate work. Countless others received vocational rehabilitation or on-the-job training. And the United States is a better country as a result. There is no profession, career, or vocation which today does not include in its ranks many, many persons who received their education or training through the assistance of the GI bills. Our defense industries, our building trades, our hospitals, our universities, our schools, our courts, indeed, every trusted and revered institution in American life, including the Congress of the United States, is today richer and much more adequately staffed as a result of the wisdom which inspired this legislation.

In an age in which democracy is under attack from all sides by isms which feed on fear and ignorance, it is imperative that we have an informed and educated and resolute citizenry. The GI bills have gone far to further this objective. Each of us knows literally hundreds of fine Americans who are today occupying positions of trust and responsibility, and are contributing to America's security and prosperity in a far greater degree than they otherwise would have been able to do, largely through the education and training provisions of these GI bills.

The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provided, in brief, that a veteran who had served in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, would be entitled to certain benefits, including medical services, disability compensation, guaranteed loans, unemployment compensation, mustering-out pay, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and education and training opportunities. The President on January 5 of this year signed

proclamation 3080 establishing January 31, 1955, as the terminal date in the computation of such veterans' benefits. Consequently, persons who enter the Armed Forces after the 31st day of January 1955, will no longer be entitled to any of the benefits afforded by the 1952 law.

I do not intend, at this time, to question the wisdom which directed the promulgation of Proclamation 3080. Certainly, the continuance of all of the benefits concerned would be an expensive proposition, and consequently should receive thoughtful consideration from both the Executive and the Congress. I shall urge the Senate to study this entire subject with care and thoughtfulness, to decide whether the termination of these benefits will operate to increase the morale of our Armed Forces at this critical hour. As the representative branch of Government, the Congress cannot abdicate its responsibility in this matter.

But one provision of Executive Order 3080 is in need of immediate consideration, and it is to this feature that my bill is partially directed.

Under the provisions of the 1952 law, and the terms of Proclamation 3080, any person in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, will be fully entitled to all of the diverse benefits of the act. Persons entering service after that date will have no such entitlement. As I say, the wisdom of this must be determined by Congress. At least all such persons will enter service with a full awareness of their eventual rights and benefits, or lack of the same. A special situation exists regarding the educational provisions of the 1952 law, however.

Section 214 (a) of Public Law 550 provides that each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training for a period equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the duration of his active service in the Armed Forces during a basic service period, up to a maximum of 36 months. This basic service period is defined, in section 201 (1) of that law, to mean the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on such date as shall be determined by the President or by Congress. Proclamation 3080 establishes January 31, 1955, as the terminal date of this period.

A person in service on January 31, 1955, and subsequently honorably discharged is entitled fully to education and training benefits. But the amount of these benefits now is restricted not to $1\frac{1}{2}$ times his period of service, but rather to $1\frac{1}{2}$ times his service between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955. Thus, a person who entered our Armed Forces on November 31, 1954, let us say, is fully entitled to education or training. But in this case he would be entitled only to 3 months' training, even though he might remain in service for the duration of a 4-year enlistment.

Proclamation 3080 thus operates to reduce the extent of education and training opportunity available for all persons who entered military service after January 31, 1953. In some instances, where persons have very recently entered the Armed Forces, they will be entitled to a period of education or training so limited as to be nugatory.

Our armed services in soliciting enlistments have capitalized greatly on the benefits promised to service personnel by the Korean GI bill. Many persons have entered the service partially motivated by a belief that they would be able, after discharge, to attend a college or university of their choice or to pursue a course of vocational or on-the-job training. Now, although still entitled to some education or training, they find that the period of enrollment has been, after their entry into service, so narrowly defined as to limit the duration of that training, irrespective of the duration of their service. Surely this constitutes a most serious breach of faith.

Many letters from service personnel already have been received in my office, even though a mere 9 days have elapsed since the issuance of proclamation 3080. These letters are in some cases indignant, and others are stern and bitter. The writers feel that they have been betrayed. I cannot in good conscience disagree. And so I strongly feel that Congress should amend the 1952 law and redress the grievances and injustices which will result from proclamation 3080.

My bill also proposes to extend the education and training opportunities of the GI bill to all persons entering the Armed Forces prior to January 31, 1957. I believe that this is the least that we can do. No unswerving desire to balance the budget and reduce taxes should blind us to the immense good which these opportunities have accomplished for our veterans and our country. We must remember that the young men and women who enter our country's military service in wartime or in days of relative peace give unhesitatingly all that is asked of them, including years of their life. We should be prepared to assure them some minimal benefits in return, particularly when we know that the United States as a whole will benefit most significantly.

Only yesterday the President requested Congress to extend the draft law for a 4-year period. In all probability, we shall be drafting and enlisting persons into our defense forces for some years to come, and all qualified persons will be required to give years of service to their country. We certainly can give something in return.

We recently have seen many ideas advanced as to how the morale of our Armed Forces can be improved. Bills to raise their pay, extend greater fringe benefits, including hospitalization and other services, are at present before the Congress and will continue to appear. And yet, at the same time, the President himself, greatly concerned over the problem of such morale, takes an action which can only operate to depress that morale.

I believe that the Senate has an obligation to act to repair the damaged morale of our Armed Forces. My bill will assist in such repair. I am confident that the Senate will accord this bill its immediate and profound attention and will act at the earliest opportunity.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY IN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper release and a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 457) to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Government and Industry, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The newspaper release and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, reintroduced in Congress today his resolution proposing the setting up of a "Hoover type" commission to coordinate all Government and industry security investigations intended to avoid

confusion, insure there be no infringement on personal liberties and avoid duplication.

The Commission would be composed of 12 members appointed by the President who will designate the chairman. The members would be selected from leaders in labor, business management and the general public while 3 Members of the Senate and 3 Members of the House would be named as advisory members. The Congress Members would have all rights given the other Commission members except they could not vote upon matters before the Commission. They would be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

MAGNUSON said he felt it is necessary to coordinate all security investigations declaring that some investigators "have tried to use the security issue not against our real enemy, but against their particular political opponents." He said that some investigators have failed to think through the problem of how to conduct security programs in such a way as to protect the very rights of the individual that would be taken away by a triumphant enemy.

The Senator said that even among Government agencies no clear pattern exists for conducting a security program. Instead, he continued, there is a crazy quilt patchwork that has been built in a hurry, clearly showing that not enough care has been taken to avoid duplication.

"Identical personnel, locations and activities are subjected to security clearings by more than one Government agency," Magnuson said. "This duplication is not only wasteful and exasperating, but can be dangerous. It does not safeguard us—it ties our hands with red tape."

The expenses of the Commission would be paid from the contingent funds of the House and the Senate. The Commission members would receive \$25 a day while attending meetings away from home, together with transportation and incidentals. MAGNUSON asked that \$50,000 be allotted by Congress to pay the cost of the Commission activities.

"Security is not something to trifle with," the Senator said. "We must protect ourselves, our rights, our traditions and form of Government against either internal or external aggression. I point out, however, that any security program must likewise protect the very liberties it seeks to preserve."

"Among other things, this means that provisions must be made for appeal and clearance of the innocent as well as detection and prosecution of the guilty."

The Senator's resolution last year was introduced late in the session and did not come to a vote on its merits.

MAGNUSON SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 3706, SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATION CONTROL BILL

The Magnuson substitute proposed a Commission on Security in Government and Industry. It proposed a Commission of 12 members to be appointed by the President and consisting of men and women who are outstanding leaders of labor, of business management, and of the general public.

In addition, the Magnuson substitute proposed an advisory committee to the Commission consisting of 6 members to be appointed from the House and Senate, 3 of whom would be appointed from the Senate and 3 from the House of Representatives. This would then insure close liaison between Congress and the Commission itself. The committee was instructed to report to the Congress and the President by January 15. The Magnuson resolution was defeated 56-31.

Senator IVES, one of the outstanding labor authorities in the Senate and a Republican, supported the Magnuson amendment. In a colloquy with Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, over an amendment the Senator from New York proposed, the following exchange took place:

"Mr. BUTLER. Because I did not think that amendment was sound, and neither do I believe the amendment of the Senator from New York is practicable."

"Mr. IVES. I think it is sound."

"With regard to the question of making a study, I have had some experience in dealing with labor-management relations and labor-management problems. From long experience in that field, one learns that the way to resolve a question, when there is a conflict of feeling of this type, is to get the groups together, as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Washington."

"For that reason I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Washington. The amendment itself would have delayed action on this matter for a period of only approximately 5 months, and I think it would be far better to get the parties in interest to sit down and arrive at something on which they would at least be in agreement."

"By the way, let me point out that the amendment provided for consultation with Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate. I believe it is far better to legislate in that way than to legislate out the whole cloth, as we are now legislating."

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, for Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KILGORE, presented by Mr. GORE, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

It will be recalled that the 83d Congress created a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Public Law 220, 83d Congress. It was the responsibility of that Commission to determine, insofar as it was able to do so, what constituted fair and reasonable compensation for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary. The Commission was instructed to report back to Congress and Congress itself was to consider and act upon the report within 60 legislative days. In fact, Congress was to enact legislation establishing the salaries of justices and judges of the courts of the United States and the salaries and mileage of Members of Congress, including the Vice President and Speaker of the House. However, no action was taken by the Congress upon the Commission's report.

The President in his state of the Union message strongly recommended that the 84th

Congress take favorable action on increased salaries for Members and judges.

The proposed legislation in part is based upon the recommendations reported to the Congress by the Commission.

The bill incorporates the identical salary recommendations suggested by the Salary Commission which are as follows:

Chief Justice of the United States.....	\$40,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.....	39,500
Vice President of the United States.....	40,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives.....	40,000
Members of Congress.....	27,500
Judges of the United States court of appeals.....	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Claims.....	30,500
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States.....	27,500
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals.....	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.....	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Customs Court.....	27,500
Judges of the United States district courts (including the United States district courts for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands).....	27,500

The Commission further recommended that the Congress establish a fund out of which the necessary expenses incurred by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and attributable to their offices be paid on a voucher basis. No specific sum was recommended by the Commission. The bill which I have introduced increases the expense allowances for these officers. At present, under existing law, the Vice President is provided with an expense allowance of \$10,000, for which no accounting, other than for income-tax purposes, is made by him. The proposed legislation retains the present \$10,000 expense allowance and provides that there shall be paid to the Vice President, upon vouchers certified by him and submitted to the Secretary of the Senate, an additional amount not to exceed \$10,000 in any calendar year for reimbursement of necessary expenses incurred and which are properly attributable to his office.

The proposed legislation retains the existing \$10,000 expense allowance for the Speaker of the House of Representatives and provides an additional amount not to exceed \$10,000 to the Speaker, upon vouchers certified by him and submitted to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives for reimbursement of necessary expenses incurred by him and which are properly attributable to his office.

Section 4 of the bill implements the recommendations of the Salary Commission which recommended that Members of the Congress should be reimbursed, upon a voucher basis, for the expenses incurred in making not to exceed six round trips per year between the District of Columbia and his residence in the State, District, or Territory which he represents. Present law provides that each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session.

This measure retains the present mileage allowance authorized by law and in addition provides that each Senator, Representative, and Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be entitled to reimbursement upon vouchers certified by them and submitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives as the case may be, for expenses incurred in making not to exceed five round trips in any calendar year, based upon the nearest route, between the District

of Columbia and his residence in the State, District, or Territory which he represents.

In its report to the Congress the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries concluded that judicial and congressional salaries:

1. Have not kept pace with the growth of the duties and responsibilities of these offices.

2. Are too low compared with salaries paid for similar ability and less responsibility in private enterprise.

3. Have lagged behind while salaries of other Federal officials were being adjusted upward.

4. Are, and for a long time have been, grossly inadequate.

5. Tend to confine these important positions to persons of independent wealth or outside earnings.

6. While no exact formula exists, standard job evaluation criteria and standards historically applied indicate what are fair and reasonable amounts.

7. The net cost of the Government of the recommended increases is small related to the immense benefit to the public welfare—\$4,527,302 for Members of the Congress and \$2,981,491 for Federal judges, an aggregate of one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

8. Present methods of payments of official expenses of Members of the Congress are antiquated and unrealistic.

A detailed review of the reasons which prompted the Commission to arrive at the recommendations represented in this proposed legislation will be found in the report of the Commission set forth in House Document No. 300, 83d Congress, 2d session.

The increases recommended by the Commission are substantial. This, however, as the Commission observes, results from the lack of frequent and periodic reviews of congressional and judicial salaries and their relationship to increases in cost of living and comparable salary payments in private industry.

The present bill would go far toward correcting inequities in the compensation of the judicial and legislative branches.

It is believed that the public interest will be served if the Congress devotes early attention to this important legislation.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS FOR CERTAIN SOCIETIES OF WHICH BENJAMIN FRANKLIN WAS A MEMBER

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, or a founder, or a sponsor, at a time when we are about to observe the 250th anniversary of his birth. The date of this anniversary will be on the 17th day of January 1956.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the greatest of the galaxy of great men to whom we owe the creation of this Nation. The older we grow as a nation the more powerful and influential we become in the councils of the world, the more necessary it is for us to be ever mindful of our humble beginnings, and to retain in grateful remembrance the names and examples of those whose wisdom guided us along the paths by which we achieved our eminence. It is fitting upon proper occasion to make public acknowledgment of those to whom we are so greatly indebted. The 250th an-

niversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin is most assuredly one of those occasions.

Benjamin Franklin was the first of the long line in the series of those who, solely by their energy, initiative, and ability, have made the American success story the wonder of the modern world. By the age of 40, Franklin had acquired sufficient substance to be able to devote his entire time to the public service. Abroad in that service, he became the most skillful diplomat of his time. At home, he aided in the drafting of and was a signer of, the Declaration of Independence. He was a signatory to the treaty of peace with Great Britain. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention. In the Convention he was the most effective and persuasive influence in reconciling differences of opinion, and by suggesting with infectious good humor that by having every member give up somewhat of his infallibility, a full accord and accommodation might be achieved. And so it was.

In science, he was a towering figure in his age; by a kite and a string and a key, he induced the lightning from the skies to obey his will; in domestic science, he invented the first practical stove; in agriculture, he was the first to demonstrate the advantageous use of commercial fertilizer; in human relations, his almanac became the common medium for the exchange of homely and practical advice among all the American people; in literature, his autobiography is one of the classics of the English language, and still is esteemed throughout the world.

Such is the briefest thumbnail sketch of a man who in many ways dominated the life of his native country and extended his influence in many ways throughout the whole civilized world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 463) to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor, in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth, introduced by Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON INTRODUCING CERTAIN RELIEF BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference several private bills.

I wish to make a brief comment on the policy of the introduction of such bills. The bills are being introduced by request. I wish the RECORD to show, however, that in this case, as in the case of all private bills, I have studied them sufficiently to satisfy myself that a prima facie case exists to justify a study of the bills by a committee. Some of the bills relate to immigration.

I am certain that my colleagues in the Senate know that from time to time we are asked to introduce so-called private

bills involving immigration rights, when the purpose is to get a stay of the deportation of the person concerned. I do not believe it is sound public policy to introduce such bills as dilatory tactics, so far as deportation is concerned, unless a Senator is convinced that a prima facie case exists justifying a stay.

When I introduce such bills, as I am doing today, by request, I want the Senate to know that I am carrying out the policy of introducing the bills after satisfying myself that a prima facie case exists.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Marie T. Gonsalves;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Whitman;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Aina Brizga;

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Lee In Ja;

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family;

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 475. A bill for the relief of Margarete R. Zimmerman;

S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Aldo Timossi; and

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumbang Subia.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools. It is a pleasure for me to announce that joining with me in introduction of this bill is the distinguished senior Senator from New York. Joining with us in the House of Representatives is the distinguished Representative from West Virginia, Mr. BAILEY, and the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. KEARNS.

The bill is a result of extensive hearings in both the Senate and the House during the past several years. It will authorize Federal financial assistance to build schools, but it will leave responsibility for administering the actual construction with the State and local school authorities who are acquainted with local needs. Its requirements for State plans to be approved by the United States Commissioner of Education will insure that the Federal funds will go where they are most needed in each State.

Our bill will do what the Federal Government should do to help solve one of our most pressing national domestic problems.

No specific amount of Federal funds is provided for in the bill, but, in view of the need, they would be as determined by the Congress. These funds would be distributed to the States according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age in

each State. The States and local school districts would be required to match the Federal funds dollar for dollar.

In order to make certain that the Federal funds will not be substituted for State and local funds that would otherwise be spent for school construction, each State educational agency would be required to submit a State plan of operation. This State plan would describe the program developed in each State, provide for full fiscal accountability by the State agency to the Federal Government for all Federal funds, provide for the establishment of standards for locating, planning, and constructing school facilities, and provide for reports to the Commissioner of Education concerning how the Federal funds have been expended.

The most important aspect of the State plan required by the bill, however, is that each State would be required to set forth principles for determining the relative priority of school facility construction projects, taking into account the relative financial resources of local school districts, the relative local efforts which have been and are being made to meet school needs out of State and local funds, and the relative urgency of local needs for the school facilities according to the extent of overcrowding and lack of facilities, and the extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are currently in use.

The United States Commissioner of Education would approve the plan of each State, but after that the administration among local school districts would be by the State agency for education.

Under the provisions of this bill, it would be impossible for any Federal agency to control in any way the programs of instruction in schools. The Federal Government would be a financial partner with the States and local school districts in constructing schools where they are most needed in each State, but the actual planning and construction of the schools would be left to the State education agencies and to the local school districts within each State.

The need is great for the Congress to act quickly to meet the school construction problem all over the country. Members of the Senate will recall that during the 81st Congress I was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on School Construction. Our hearings demonstrated a crying, urgent demand for action by the Congress to help alleviate the school construction need. The hearings before our committee showed the untold numbers of children—the future leaders of tomorrow—attending school in unsafe firetraps and in shifts like factory workers. This is indeed a sorry reflection on the values of our society.

The administration is today talking of a plan for the building of roads which will cost more than \$100 billion. We need roads, Mr. President, and I intend to support any intelligent and moderate plan to help build roads, but can any of us say that the building of roads has a priority over the building of schools? The interest by men in high places in the road needs of the United States is commendable, but let us never lose

sight of the fact that the basic strength of our Nation is in our people, in our children, and in our educational system. It indeed would be unconscionable and unwise for us to concentrate on road building and on the Federal Government's role in that activity and then to ignore the Federal Government's responsibility for the building of schools for our children.

In my own State of Minnesota the need is great. The State education commissioner reported that to provide sufficient classroom space for all the Minnesota children who will be in school by 1960 would cost \$330,471,856.

In Minnesota a school district may borrow up to 50 percent of its assessed valuation. A large number of districts can borrow this amount of money, but there are 257 that cannot borrow sufficient money in order to provide sufficient classrooms. If they borrowed the limit they would still need in Minnesota \$75 million net to provide for classroom space for these 257 school districts.

Prior to 1947 the State provided to the school districts in the form of special State aids for maintenance purposes about \$16 million. For the current school year the legislature provided \$64 million. The State pays 40 percent of the maintenance operation of school districts in our State. Minnesota needs the assistance for school buildings this bill would authorize, although I am well aware that many other States have an even more serious problem than has Minnesota.

Let me illustrate: Bloomington is south of Minneapolis. It is a consolidated school district, but the population has greatly increased. They have borrowed to the maximum of their ability and their assessed valuation is about \$10 million. They have bonded themselves for \$5 million. They cannot borrow any more money. In 3 out of the last 5 years the district operated the elementary schools on half-time schedules. This year they are operating the secondary schools, the junior and senior high schools, on half-time schedules. The superintendent says that if they do not secure some help they may have to run their high school on a triple schedule sometime in the near future.

It is estimated that by 1960 we should have at least 10,000 additional classrooms in Minnesota. Our school population is increasing by 20,000 a year. Our records show that in our elementary and secondary school districts, they are pouring in in increasing numbers. This condition is common throughout the Nation.

There is a real national interest in education because our national strength, future growth, and ability to make wise decisions in the years to come depend largely upon it. We need to make the Federal Government a real partner of the States and local school districts in meeting this urgent problem. I hope the 84th Congress will alleviate the critical school-building shortage along the lines of the bill that the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and I are proud to introduce.

The Congress recognized its responsibility in the area of school construction during the 81st Congress when it enacted a bill, of which I was proud to be the author, authorizing a survey of school-construction needs. That survey is now completed. It reaffirms the need. There is no need for further delay in order to obtain more facts and additional studies. The time to act is now. I request the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to begin hearings on our proposal and other proposals for school construction as soon as possible so that we in the Congress can fulfill our responsibilities to the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 480) to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. Ives), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JEROME C. HUNSAKER AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent that a statement with reference to Dr. Hunsaker, together with the joint resolution, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Mass., on April 7, 1955, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

[From *Who's Who in America*]

Hunsaker, Jerome Clarke, aeronautical engr.; b. Creston, Iowa, August 26, 1886, s. Walter J. and Alma (Clarke) II; grad. U. S. Naval Acad., 1908; M. S., Mass. Inst. Tech., 1912, D. Sc., 1916; D. Sc. Hon., Williams Coll., 1943; Eng. D., Northeastern Univ., 1945; married Alice Porter Avery, June 26, 1911; children—Mrs. Sarah Porter Swope, Jerome Clarke, James Peter, Mrs. T. A. Bird. Officer, later advancing to commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, 1909-23; in-

structor of aeronautic engineering, Mass. Inst. Tech., 1912-16; in charge aircraft design, Navy Dept., Wash., D. C.; designed airship *Shenandoah* and flying boat *NC-4*; 1st to fly Atlantic, 1916-23; asst. naval attaché, London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, 1923-26; asst. vice pres., Bell Telephone Labs. (wire and radio services for airways), 1926-28; vice pres., Goodyear Zeppelin Corp., 1928-33; head of dept. aeronautical engineering, Mass. Inst. Tech., 1933-51; now prof. emeritus; lecturer; director, McGraw Hill Pub. Co., Sperry Corp., Shell Oil Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; chairman, N. A. C. A.; captain, U. S. N. R.; retired officer, Legion of Honor (France). Fellow American Phys. Soc., Am. Acad. Arts & Sciences; hon. fellow Inst. of the A. S. Royal Aeronautic Soc. of Britain; hon. mem., Am. Soc. Mech. Engrs., Inst. Mech. Engrs.; mem., Soc. Naval Architects and Marine Engineers (London), Amer. Soc. Automotive Engrs., Nat. Acad. of Sciences, Am. Philos. Soc., Delta Kappa Epsilon, Sigma Xi. Awarded Navy Cross, Medal for Merit (U. S.); Daniel Guggenheim medal, Franklin medal; Wright Brothers memorial trophy. Clubs: Century (New York, N. Y.), Army & Navy (Wash.), St. Botolph (Boston). Contributor to journals of professional societies. Home: 10 Louisburg Square, Boston. Office: Mass. Inst. Tech., Cambridge, Mass.

OMNIBUS NARCOTICS CONTROL ACT OF 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, since the end of World War II, there has been an alarming increase of traffic in narcotic drugs. The increased use of narcotics by teen-agers has been of great concern, since it is closely related to the increase in juvenile delinquency. With the present strained international situation, it is no consolation to know that Communist China is the leading source of supply of the illicit drugs being used to corrupt our young people.

The apparent failure of present national and international methods of narcotic control has aroused interest at all regulatory levels in discovering the nature of the entire narcotic problem and, thus, the basis of its solution. In November, President Eisenhower approved the creation of an Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics, which is in the process of making a comprehensive survey of the extent of narcotic addiction in the United States. Several States are currently revising and strengthening their narcotic laws. The Bureau of Narcotics, under the able leadership of Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, continues to be one of the chief deterrents to further increase in narcotic addiction, in spite of presently inadequate laws and funds.

It is felt that the time has come for a comprehensive review by Congress of our narcotic laws in order to determine what should be done on this national social problem so as to strengthen the hands of the appropriate Federal and State officials with responsibility in this field. Organizations such as the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce have interested themselves in the need for new legislation on this subject.

During the 83d Congress, various bills dealing with different phases of the narcotics problem were introduced. Last fall, I prepared an omnibus bill incorporating many of the previous legislative

proposals and some new material, and 41 Senators have agreed to cosponsor the bill with me. This omnibus bill is a comprehensive measure covering the organization and powers of the Bureau of Narcotics and its personnel; providing increased penalties for regular narcotics violations, with even more severe penalties for sales to minors; authorizing expansion of treatment and rehabilitation facilities and programs; and, perhaps most important of all, authorizing the establishment of educational and research activities in the field of narcotics addiction.

It is intended that this omnibus bill shall serve as a starting point in reviewing the Federal narcotics laws and programs. It is recognized that the bill contains controversial features on which there can be honest disagreement. The appropriate committee will be in a position to evaluate these differences of opinion after hearings on the bill have been held.

I should like to invite all interested citizens and organizations to join in this campaign for reviewing and strengthening our narcotics laws and programs as an essential first step in stamping out this national social problem.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the

Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution entitled "Narcotics Control Act of 1955." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution and a memorandum explaining it section by section, along with an article entitled "The Story Behind Red China's Dope Peddlers," by Irwin Ross, from the New Leader for December 20, 1954; a brief pamphlet entitled "Living Death: The Truth About Drug Addictions," issued by the Bureau of Narcotics; and a series of five articles entitled "The Nation's Narcotic Problem," written by Milton Lewis, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune in December, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the matters referred to, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19), submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the postwar period has witnessed a substantial and alarming increase in the illicit supply and demand for narcotic drugs in the United States, notwithstanding strenuous efforts on the part of Federal and State authorities; and

Whereas illicit traffic in narcotic drugs for profit are the primary and sustaining sources of addiction and are of material danger to public morals, health, safety, and welfare; and

Whereas narcotic-drug addiction on the part of minors is particularly undesirable, is observed similarly to have increased in the postwar period, and is known historically to occur during periods of increased juvenile delinquency such as appears today; and

Whereas strongly deterrent penal laws, with alert enforcement, are acknowledged to be the most effective method of terminating illicit traffic and supply of narcotic drugs for profit; and

Whereas the need continues and grows for reduction of the demand for such drugs through proper treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of persons already addicted to the use of narcotics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, *etc.*, That this act, divided into titles, may be cited as the "Narcotics Control Act of 1955."

TITLE I—ORGANIZATION

TRANSFER OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

SEC. 101. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Attorney General all functions of the Bureau of Narcotics, and all functions of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto.

(b) The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Justice of any function transferred to such Attorney General by the provisions of this section.

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Department of Justice, to be used, employed, and expended in connection with the functions transferred by the provisions of this section, the records and property now being used or held in connection with such functions, the personnel employed in connection

with such functions, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for use in connection with such functions. Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Budget shall determine to be necessary in order to effectuate the transfers provided in this subsection shall be carried out in such manner as the Director shall direct and by such agencies as he shall designate.

POWERS OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

SEC. 102. (a) Chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3061. Powers of the Bureau of Narcotics.

"The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant to the Commissioner, and agents of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of Justice may carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, serve subpoenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States, and make arrests without warrant for violations of any law of the United States relating to narcotic drugs (as defined in the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C., sec. 171)) or marihuana (as defined in sec. 3238 of the Internal Revenue Code) where the violation is committed in the presence of the person making the arrest or where such person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person arrested has committed or is committing such violation."

(b) The analysis of chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 3041 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3061. Powers of the Bureau of Narcotics."

DIVISION OF NARCOTIC CLINICS

SEC. 103. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to establish in the Public Health Service a Division of Narcotic Clinics for the treatment of narcotics addicts which shall—

(1) establish and maintain hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the care and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(2) assist the several States and reputable private agencies to establish and maintain hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the care and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(3) train and educate personnel for the several States and reputable private institutions in its approved methods for treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of those suffering from drug addiction;

(4) utilize the facilities of the United States Employment Service in obtaining useful and suitable employment for those former sufferers from chronic alcoholism and drug addiction who have been discharged from hospitals of the Bureau and assist States and reputable private institutions in placement of discharged patients; and

(5) cooperate with, advise, consult with, and encourage the organization of associations, public and private, engaged in work with drug addiction.

SEC. 104. The Director of the Division of Narcotic Clinics and all other necessary personnel, shall be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare without regard to the civil-service laws and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of their office. The compensation of all employees shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 105. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 103 and 104 of this title.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. The Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended by redesignating section 345 as section 346 and by inserting after section 344 the following new section:

"PERSONS COMMITTED BY STATE COURTS

"SEC. 345. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to admit for care and treatment in any hospital of the Service suitably equipped therefor, and thereafter to transfer between hospitals of the Service in accordance with section 321 (b), any addict who is committed by a court of competent jurisdiction of a State or by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to the Service or to a hospital thereof for care and treatment and who the Surgeon General determines is a proper subject for such care and treatment. No such addict shall be admitted unless suitable accommodations are available after all eligible addicts convicted of offenses against the United States have been admitted, and unless the State agrees to pay to the United States, either in advance or otherwise, as may be determined by the Surgeon General, all costs involved in providing such care and treatment (including the cost of transportation to and from facilities of the Public Health Service). Such costs may be determined for each addict or on the basis of rates established for all or particular classes of patients.

"(b) Any person admitted to a hospital of the Service pursuant to subsection (a) shall be discharged therefrom when he is found by the Surgeon General to be cured and rehabilitated, or at the request of the proper authorities of the State in which is situated the committee court.

"(c) With respect to the detention, transfer, parole, or discharge of any person committed to a hospital of the Service in accordance with subsection (a), the Surgeon General and the officer in charge of the hospital, in addition to authority otherwise vested in them, shall have such authority as may be conferred upon them, respectively, by the law of the State in which is situated the committing court or by the order of the committing court.

"(d) Moneys paid to the United States for the care and treatment of persons committed in accordance with subsection (a) shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Appropriations available for the care and treatment of addicts admitted to a hospital of the Service under this section shall be available, subject to regulations, for paying the cost of transportation to any State, including subsistence allowance while traveling, for any such addict who is indigent and is discharged."

SEC. 202. The first sentence of section 341 of such act is amended to read: "The Surgeon General is authorized to provide for the confinement, care, protection, treatment, and discipline of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who voluntarily submit themselves for treatment, addicts who have been or are hereafter convicted of offenses against the United States, including persons convicted by general courts-martial and consular courts, and addicts who are committed to the Service or to a hospital thereof pursuant to section 345."

SEC. 203. The third sentence of section 344 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows: "No such addict shall be admitted unless he agreed to submit to treatment for the maximum amount of time estimated by the Surgeon General to be necessary to effect a cure, and unless suitable accommodations are available after all eligible addicts convicted of offenses against the United States

and all eligible addicts committed pursuant to section 345 have been admitted."

SEC. 204. Such act is further amended by adding the following new section after the section herein redesignated as section 346:

"RELEASE OF PATIENTS

"SEC. 347. For purposes of this act, an individual shall be deemed cured of his addiction if the Surgeon General determines that he has received the maximum benefits of treatment and care by the Service for his addiction or if the Surgeon General determines that his further treatment and care for such purpose would be detrimental to the interests of the Service."

PENALTIES

SEC. 205. Section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whoever fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings any narcotic drug into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this subdivision, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this subdivision or in section 2557 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or section 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code enacted February 10, 1939 (ch. 2, 53 Stat. 274, 282), as amended. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this subdivision.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this subdivision the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury."

SEC. 206. Section 2557 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Whoever commits an offense or conspires to commit an offense described in this

subchapter, subchapter C of this chapter, or parts V or VI of subchapter A of chapter 27, for which no specific penalty is otherwise provided, shall be fined not more than \$3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this paragraph, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this paragraph or in section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or sections 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code enacted February 10, 1939 (ch. 2, 53 Stat. 274, 282), as amended. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this paragraph."

SEC. 207. (a) Whoever sells, transfers, barter, exchanges, or gives away, or facilitates the sale, transfer, barter, exchange, or giving away, of any narcotic drug as defined in section 1 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 171), in violation of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 171-185), or of sections 2550-2565 or 3220-3228 of the Internal Revenue Code, to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years, shall, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for 20 years. For a second offense, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, the offender shall suffer death, unless the jury qualifies its verdict by adding thereto "without capital punishment", in which event he shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

(b) Whoever sells, transfers, barter, exchanges, or gives away, or facilitates the sale, transfer, barter, exchange, or giving away, of marihuana as defined in section 3238 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, in violation of sections 2590-2603 or 3230-3238 of the Internal Revenue Code, to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years, shall, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for 10 years. For a second or subsequent offense, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, the offender shall be punished by imprisonment for 20 years.

(c) For the purposes of this section, an offender shall be considered a second offender if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this section. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall

be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or second offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this section. Upon conviction for an offense, the penalty for which is provided for in this section, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted.

(d) The provisions of this section shall apply only with respect to offenses committed on or after the effective date of this act.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 208. (a) It is the purpose of this section to encourage the establishment in teachers' colleges of courses to instruct teachers and prospective teachers in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction, so that they may be better prepared, as teachers, to minimize or prevent narcotic addiction among their students.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "teachers' college" means any college, university, or other educational institution which offers courses designed to prepare individuals to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, such sums as Congress may determine for grants to carry out the purpose of this section. From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall make grants to eligible teachers' colleges to pay, in whole or in part, the compensation of instructors teaching courses in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction. Payments under this subsection may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

(2) A teachers' college shall be eligible for a grant under this section if it offers a course of not less than _____ hours of instruction in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction, and if it complies with such other conditions of eligibility as the Secretary prescribes by regulation in order to carry out the purpose of this section.

(d) (1) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this section (except the making of regulations under subsection (c) (2) to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The Secretary shall make annual reports to the Congress as to the administration of this section.

SEC. 209. (a) In order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to determine the best methods of educating students enrolled in and pursuing a program of education or training leading to a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree to all aspects of the narcotic addiction problem, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with State educational agencies, local school systems, and public and nonprofit educational institutions and organizations for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations with respect to all phases of such problem with particular

reference to the prevention of narcotic addiction.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such sums as the Congress determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 210. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

The matters presented by Mr. PAYNE are as follows:

MEMORANDUM ANALYSIS OF PAYNE NARCOTICS BILL

TITLE I—ORGANIZATION

Section 101. Transfer of Bureau of Narcotics: This section would transfer the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice as recommended by the first Hoover Commission. In its report on the Treasury Department the Hoover Commission stated:

"The work of the Bureau of Narcotics is of two kinds. Law enforcement, or the detection and apprehension of violators of the narcotic laws, accounts for about 80 percent of the work of the Bureau. About 20 percent of its work consists of regulating the flow and manufacture of drugs and preparations made from narcotics. This latter phase of its work is done primarily through licensing.

"The relation of the Bureau to the rest of the Treasury Department is largely confined to cooperation with the Customs Bureau in administering the prohibitive features of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act at the ports. Its other major relations are with the Federal Security Agency and the State Department.

"The police work of the Bureau involves much of the same kind of relationship with State and local police authorities as is maintained by the Department of Justice for other types of Federal law enforcement. Duplication could be eliminated and economy achieved by consolidating the work of the Bureau of Narcotics with that of the law enforcement work of the Department of Justice. The same working relations would of necessity be maintained with the Customs Bureau.

"At the same time crime detection within the country would be facilitated by a single channel of contact with State and local authorities in the apprehension of violators who generally form a part of the criminal element shifting or combining their activities with other lawless acts." (Treasury Department, a report to the Congress by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (first Hoover Commission), March 1949, H. Doc. 115, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 8-9.)

Section 102. Powers of Bureau of Narcotics: This section would give agents of the Bureau of Narcotics power to carry firearms, execute and serve warrants, serve subpoenas, and make arrests without warrants for narcotic law violations. This would give narcotics agents powers similar to those of FBI agents.

Sections 103-105. Division of Narcotic Clinics: These sections would create within the Public Health Service a Division of Narcotic Clinics to establish and operate hospitals, farms, and other institutions for the treatment of narcotic addicts and to foster and aid States and reputable private groups working in this field.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sections 201-204. Public Health Service Act Amendments: These sections would authorize the care and treatment by the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and the United States District

Court for the District of Columbia with the States and District of Columbia paying the cost of such care and treatment.

Sections 205-206. Penalties for narcotic violations: These sections would amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act and the Internal Revenue Code to increase penalties for regular narcotic violations as follows:

First offense: Present provision, \$2,000 and "not less than 2 or more than 5 years." Proposed provision, \$3,000 and not less than 5 or more than 10 years.

Offense	Present provision for both narcotics and marihuana	Proposed provision for narcotics	Proposed provision for marihuana
1st.....	\$2,000 and "not less than 2 or more than 5 years."	20 years.....	10 years.
2d and subsequent....	\$2,000 and "not less than 5 or more than 10 years."	Death unless jury qualifies verdict to read "without capital punishment," then imprisonment for life.	20 years.

Sections 208-209. Educational activities: Section 208 would authorize grants to educational institutions preparing individuals to teach in elementary and secondary schools to help defray the cost of courses in the causes and effects of narcotic addiction. Section 209 would authorize research and studies in narcotic addiction and its prevention.

Section 210. Effective date: Effective date to be the 1st day of 2d month beginning after enactment.

[From the New Leader of December 20, 1954]

THE STORY BEHIND RED CHINA'S DOPE PEDDLERS

(By Irwin Ross)

The case of the camphorwood chests broke in an odd way. On December 17, 1953, Ernest Gentry, head of the San Francisco office of the Bureau of Narcotics, received an anonymous phone call from a man who spoke with a Chinese accent. If Mr. Gentry would go to a certain address, he would find two very interesting camphorwood clothes chests which had just arrived from Hong Kong. Before the day was out, Gentry had taken possession of the chests, together with 2 pounds of heroin ingeniously imbedded in the wood, and 2 Chinese seamen who had transported the contraband.

One of them, Wing Dee Joe, was head cook of the steamship *President Cleveland* and a highly accomplished smuggler. On previous trips from Hong Kong he had brought in 16 pounds of heroin, worth at least \$1 million on the retail market.

Gentry is still puzzled as to who his helper was. There is no mystery, however, about the origin of the heroin. For it was light tan in color, rough in texture, and almost pure. To the experienced eye of the Bureau of Narcotics, this meant one thing—it had come from Red China.

Since their rise to power, the Chinese Communists have been engaged in the massive and profitable export of narcotics to southeast Asia, Japan, and the United States. For the free world, the situation is alarming. Before the war, the worldwide drug traffic was declining. Now it is booming—largely due to the efforts of the Chinese Communist Government.

With its foreign trade at a low ebb, the regime desperately needs hard currency—to buy imports and to finance Communist activities throughout Asia. Moreover, under its 1950 agreement with Soviet Russia, Red China must pay for part of its Soviet war supplies in gold or United States dollars, so it has turned to dope peddling to get the cash. And the Communists are not averse to softening up the enemy by spreading addiction. "We are not dealing with a petty adversary," says United States Commissioner

Second offense: Present provision, \$2,000 and "not less than 5 or more than 10 years." Proposed provision, \$5,000 and not less than 10 or more than 20 years.

Third or subsequent offense: Present provision, \$2,000 and "not less than 10 or more than 20 years." Proposed provision, imprisonment for life.

Section 207. Penalties for sale or furnishing of narcotics to minors: This section would increase penalties for sale or furnishing of narcotics and marihuana to persons under 21 years of age as follows:

of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger, "but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange and * * * demoralize the people of the free world."

Facts support these words. Before World War II, the Chinese Nationalists had achieved a measure of success in curbing the opium trade. The death penalty for narcotics traffickers was enacted. By 1939, Chinese opium production was down to 1,200 tons a year. Today, it stands at an estimated 6,000 tons, of which 2,000 is exported, either as smoking opium, as heroin or as morphine. Those 2,000 tons are more than double all other illicit narcotics production in the world.

In his report to the U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Anslinger has provided abundant proof that this flood of dope comes from Red China. Much of the heroin seized in the Far East during the last 5 years bore Chinese addresses or brand names—such as the well-known Red Lion and Lions Globe brands. Moreover, this heroin had rough granular texture, a tan color, and a purity content as high as 90 or 95 percent. Thus, when heroin of similar characteristics—minus the labeling—has shown up in the Far East or the United States, it has been easy to identify its origin. Heroin coming from Europe is white, smooth in texture and of a low purity—generally 10 or 15 percent. Mexican heroin is around 35 percent pure.

There is one other way to trace the origin of narcotics—from the statements of captured traffickers. These confessions have led the Japanese, Thai, Burmese, and Malayan Governments to report to the United Nations that Red China was the source of vast quantities of drugs entering their countries.

During the last war, however, traffickers in Japan have become too frightened to talk. For the Communist ringleaders have begun to take fierce vengeance on those who do: a simple matter of cutting off an ear or two. "This method proved effective," Commissioner Anslinger noted dryly in one of his reports.

From underground sources in China and American agents in the Far East, Anslinger has collected a mass of data on the methods and organizations of the China drug trade. The Communists' interest in opium goes back to the late 1930's, when they were only a guerrilla army controlling sections of the northwest hinterland. In Shensi Province, vast quantities of heroin were manufactured and parceled out to Red agents, who received instruction in distributing it in areas controlled by the Nationalists. The embattled Communists were hard up; drugs brought easy money to swell the party's coffers. In their own areas, however, the comrades sought to curb opium smoking.

Po I-po, an enterprising "youth leader," was one of the leading operatives. After his party came to power in 1949, Po was elevated to the post of Minister of Finance. He im-

mediately began to step up the export of narcotics; by 1954, the Communist regime was grossing an estimated \$150 million a year from what is euphemistically called special trade.

Today, Government officials supervise both drug manufacture and export. In the western province of Szechuan, for example, the Governor controls opium production and also operates a heroin factory. In southwestern Yunnan, the business is run by the Deputy Governor and the chief of the secret police. In Kwangtung Province, poppy planting has trebled since 1951.

The foreign sale of narcotics is supervised by the National Trading Co., of Peking, a state agency. Ostensibly private trading companies—in China and in foreign cities—are used as fronts to handle the merchandise and collect the receipts.

The drugs leave China by several routes. Armed caravans travel south from Yunnan through the jungle to Burma, whence the stuff finds its way to Thailand, Malaya, and Indochina. From Canton, it is but a short voyage by rail or ship to British Hong Kong or Portuguese Macao; and, from these points, heroin is sent by plane and ship all over the world. Another route is by small smuggling boats from Korea and north China to Japan. These craft carry narcotics on the outboard trip and bring back tires, ball bearings, small machine tools, and other strategic materials purchased on the black market.

Japan has perhaps been victimized more than any other country in Asia. "Right after the war," Commissioner Anslinger has said, "I do not think you could have found one heroin addict in Japan. Today, on a per capita basis, they have more than we have."

The first definite proof that Japanese Communist officials were actively engaged in the heroin traffic came to light in October 1950. Undercover agents in Tokyo arranged to make a purchase from three prosperous Japanese citizens, one of whom ran an automobile agency. After the heroin was delivered, in a restaurant in downtown Tokyo, the agents arrested the trio. Two of the men, it turned out, were officials of the Tokyo Communist Party. In the jacket of one of them was found the business card of Hitoshi Yamamoto, chief of the Communist Party for the island of Kyushu—a high post, for it covered seven prefectures.

One of the Communist traffickers confessed that Yamamoto had furnished them with the drug. He was arrested and eventually revealed that his source of supply was a North Korean Communist. The clandestine operation had proceeded for many months, with the profits going to the support of the Communist Party.

The situation in South Korea has been equally serious. A long land border with the Communists facilitated smuggling; and, in the disorganized conditions of an invaded nation, effective law enforcement has been difficult. The heroin that flooded the country has come from both China and North Korea, where there was a large factory in Pyongyang. Its existence was not open to dispute: MacArthur's troops captured it when they took the town.

In one 12-month period, shortly before the armistice, 2,400 North Korean Communists, usually posing as refugees, were seized by police in possession of heroin. Among them were many girls, 18 to 23, who had taken jobs as housemaids or brothel inmates and peddled heroin on the side. Most of them had attended a 6-month training course at a North Korean school, where they had been instructed in Communist ideology and underground operations.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the drug traffic in Korea and Japan has been the spread of addiction among American troops. In January 1953, Cardinal Spellman created something of a sensation when he

returned from a trip to the Korean front to declare that a frightfully high percentage of American GI's were using narcotics. The Cardinal gave no figures, but his words of alarm focused attention on the problem.

From 1952 through the first quarter of 1954 a total of 1,613 troops were under investigation "for engaging in narcotics traffic." Some were suspected of peddling, but most of using drugs. Figures on court-martial convictions are naturally lower. They show that, from 1951 through August 1953, 899 men were convicted. Any police operation reaches only a proportion of offenders. Thus, it is a fair inference that many more than 899 guilty individuals escaped detection.

By 1949 the Bureau of Narcotics realized that the Communist smuggling operation had reached these shores. During the last 3 years the influx of Communist heroin has reached alarming proportions. It now accounts for an unprecedented amount of the heroin sold here.

Narcotics agents have made dozens of seizures on the west coast, but recently the east coast has also been invaded. Last February, for example, the SS. *President Arthur* docked in Jersey City after coming halfway around the world. Most of the crew had gone ashore when two port patrol officers decided to frisk a seaman whom they saw sauntering down a gangplank. A cursory frisking produced nothing suspicious; then they noticed a few flecks of powder on one of his shoes. What was this? He explained that he was a steward and must have split some flour in the pantry.

The customs men had him remove his foot gear and found a rubber tube containing a light tan powder in each of his outside shoes. One of the tubes had sprung a leak. At this point the steward was stripped to the skin. Seventeen containers were found around his middle, the bulge being disguised under two layers of underwear. All told, the tubes contained 20 ounces of heroin—and back in the pantry another 31 ounces were found. The steward explained that he had bought his supply for \$1,800 from a taxi driver in Singapore. Its Chinese origin, however, was unmistakable from its appearance and chemical composition.

The first big United States case involving Communist heroin came in January 1952. At the Rincin post office in San Francisco, customs verifier, Myron Kahn, became curious about a stack of 20 old American magazines, each separately wrapped, which had arrived from Hong Kong. He had been struck by the fact that the sender had overpaid postage on each magazine, affixing airmail stamps costing \$10.50 (Hong Kong) or \$1.50 (United States). So Kahn took a close look and discovered that in each magazine some 25 pages had been hollowed out to provide space for a glazed paper envelope. And in each envelope were 3 ounces of heroin.

Customs rewrapped the 20 magazines, and in due course an agent, disguised as a postman, delivered them to a gray-haired, stoop-shouldered man at the St. Clair Hotel. When he accepted the bundles, he was placed under arrest. His name was James Carroll, an old narcotics offender who had once served time in McNeil Island Federal Penitentiary. In the past year, he had received several shipments of magazines, sent him, he later confessed, by one Judah I. Ezra of Hong Kong, like Carroll an old alumnus of McNeil's.

Carroll had first begun getting similar magazines in 1951; all told, he had received 16½ pounds of heroin. Carroll was only paid \$5 per magazine. His function was limited to turning over the copies to an undisclosed Chinese, whom he would meet on a street corner or in a bar.

Carroll was by no means the only mail drop. Five months after he was knocked off, an alert postal clerk in Penryn, Calif., dis-

covered another cache of heroin in magazines sent from Hong Kong to one Fong Wing Suey, alias Tommy Gee. He and a friend had an elaborate mail operation underway, with three post-office boxes in different localities in Placer County.

Ezra was involved in even bigger operations. For a year, up to the spring of 1954, he was recruiting seamen to carry heroin from Hong Kong to a large group of customers in San Francisco. They were wholesale dealers who resold the merchandise in pound lots to retailers.

Among their steady customers was a quick-witted Chinese who talked like a veteran of the narcotics underworld—as indeed he was, being an agent of the Bureau of Narcotics. From October 1953 to January 1954, he purchased 5 pounds of heroin from several dealers, spending \$27,000 of the Government's money.

The wholesale ring centered around two respectable Chinatown establishments—the Fragrant Flower Shop and the China Emporium. Pon Wai, the flower merchant, delivered his heroin neatly stacked away in boxes of flowers. When the Bureau of Narcotics swooped down on the culprits one quiet April Sunday, they cracked one of the biggest drug rings ever to operate on the Pacific coast. Eight men were arrested, and Judah Ezra, in Hong Kong, was put out of business—at least for the time being.

These intermittent victories do not make Commissioner Anslinger complacent. As long as the Chinese Communists keep dumping huge quantities of drugs on the underworld markets, no police effort is going to keep the stuff entirely out of the United States. Anslinger pins his hope on pitiless publicity, pointing out that in the distant past the League of Nations cleaned up deplorable situations in France, Switzerland, and Turkey by endlessly calling attention to the facts. But is Red China likely to prove at all responsive to world opinion? Its recent performance gives little ground for hope.

LIVING DEATH: THE TRUTH ABOUT DRUG ADDICTION

All men and women will benefit if they learn how to protect themselves and their friends from one of the worst dangers of all time—drug addiction.

The best protection is to know the plain truth about what it does to the human body.

Here are the facts, gathered from medical experts:

WHAT IS A DRUG ADDICT?

Teen-age drug addiction in its inception and in its continuance is generally due to vice, vicious environment, and criminal associations, but it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the smoking of the marihuana cigarette is a dangerous first step on the road which usually leads to enslavement by heroin.

A drug addict is a person who continues to use habit-forming drugs—chiefly morphine or heroin (which is derived from morphine). By taking one of these drugs frequently for a short time a person can become an addict.

He gets such an abnormal desire for the drug that he feels he cannot get along without it. When he cannot get the drug he suffers horribly. He feels that his muscles are being torn from his arms and legs. He has violent pains in his stomach. He vomits and has diarrhea, often of a bloody type. He becomes depressed and wants to kill himself.

The idea that an addict takes "dope" just to feel good is a mistake. He takes it to head off for a little while the horrible effects he feels when he doesn't have the drug.

WHAT DRUG ADDICTION DOES TO THE MOUTH, STOMACH, AND INTESTINES

First, let's consider the mouth, stomach, and intestines. The vital secretions of the

body are decreased through steady use of narcotics. The mouth should not be acid, but repeated taking of narcotics makes it so. The teeth rot and fall out.

This isn't a pretty picture but it is something every person needs to know for his own safety and for that of friends he may help by pointing out the truth.

With secretions decreased in the stomach and intestines, a person loses his natural appetite and becomes sluggish and haggard. Also, movement of muscles in the stomach and intestines is reduced, resulting in constipation. The gallbladder is involved—often becoming inflamed. Victims suffer from jaundice, which causes loss of energy and makes the eyes and skin turn an ugly yellow.

EFFECTS ON THE NOSE AND LUNGS

Some drug addicts take narcotics through the nose by sniffing. Here is what happens to them. From sniffing dope, the membrane lining the nose becomes inflamed and red. Ulcers appear. They get deep and a hole is likely to form in the partition between the nostrils. Breathing is badly affected. Ordinarily, one breathes in and out about 17 times a minute. The addict's breathing is slowed down to as little as four times a minute as a result of the poisonous action of overdoses of morphine.

The addict's inability to breathe normally cuts down the supply of oxygen he needs for his blood. Over a period, the addict is easy prey not only to bronchitis but also to such dread diseases as tuberculosis.

DAMAGE TO THE NERVOUS SYSTEM

Perhaps some persons who become narcotic addicts are none too bright before they start. But the drug habit can fasten its terrible hold just as easily on the "smart" individual who thinks he knows it all and won't listen to sound medical advice.

The more anyone gets sunk into addiction, the more the weak traits he started with are exaggerated and his good traits disappear. Any strength of character the addict may have had originally is greatly weakened.

A young person who gets into addiction is sleepy most of the time. He becomes poor in his studies and athletics. He is cross, tells stupid lies, or refuses to talk at all.

When a dose of narcotics wears off, every nerve from the top of the addict's head to the tips of his toes tortures him. His nose runs and he starts to twitch. He has imaginary and fantastic fears.

Continuing to take habit-forming drugs in many cases results in complete insanity or a career of crime. It wrecks major functions of the body, including the nervous system. It destroys judgment and will power. It is a living hell—mentally, physically, and emotionally.

OTHER DAMAGE

Morphine and the opiates are thrown off by the body through the kidneys and the intestines. A body poison is formed in this process.

This has a very bad effect on the sex organs. Men addicts, if they wish to marry and raise a family, may not be able to become fathers. Women addicts, if they can have children, pass the poison along to their babies.

As one symptom of addiction, the veins gradually collapse, leaving purple marks on the skin. The addict suffers severe pain. Boils and abscesses plague him as a result of the injuries he has inflicted on his skin. He awakens after a tortured night with his pillow soaked with perspiration.

The sparkle of a pleasing personality is lost. He is too sleepy and unreliable to hold a good job, although he needs an enormous amount of money to keep up his drug habit.

He loses interest in everyone around him and is careless about his person. His interest narrows down to concern about only one thing—getting another dose of the drug. He ceases to be a real human being or a regular fellow.

ADDICTS DIE YOUNG

On the average, persons who are drug addicts live 20 to 25 years less than they would if they were not addicts. And, for the poor addict, you can hardly call "life" more than a living death.

A prominent authority has made a study of how death rates of narcotic addicts compare with those of the general population. His study shows that:

Opium addicts die of tuberculosis at the rate of 4 to 1, compared to nonaddicts; more than 2 to 1, of pneumonia; more than 5 to 1, of premature old age; 4 to 1, of bronchitis; 3 to 1, of brain hemorrhage; 3 to 1, of cancer and other malignant tumors, and more than 2 to 1, of a wide variety of other diseases.

This, indeed, is clear evidence of the vast and dreadful power of habit-forming drugs, repeatedly used, to weaken a person's natural resistance to diseases that result in death.

HOW NOT TO START

The only way to avoid ending up as a drug addict is to use plain common sense and not to start. You don't learn to keep away from addiction by experimenting with it. If you do experiment, it will surely get a stranglehold on you.

Usually, a person is tempted first with marihuana cigarettes. He may not even know they are dope. Then, some dope peddler or his stooge makes it easy to try some heroin, just to enslave a new and steady customer—knowing that later on he can exact frightfully high prices from a hopeless addict. Most teen-age addicts started by smoking marihuana cigarettes.

Some young persons who are being trapped are dared to try the stuff. Some think that they are exceptions and can handle anything. But they are wrong. They can't fool with narcotics. Nobody can.

When a person realizes that peddlers or their agents are trying to snare him, he should realize that he is having a terrifying look, face to face, at what probably is the foulest racket in existence. It must be squelched through the vigilance of everyone, the full power of the law, and the aid of every enlightened man and woman.

Avoid a drug addict the same as you would a "Typhoid Mary" because his plague is just as contagious.

What we have been talking about is the criminal misuse of habit-forming drugs. Incidentally, it is as much against the law to buy illegal drugs as it is to sell them. Drug violations by teen-agers particularly are soon detected, and are subject to severe punishment under Federal law: 2 years for the first offense; 5 years for the second; and 10 years for the third. In many places, addiction itself is an offense for which the addict must undergo compulsory imprisonment in an institution until cured.

Narcotics have many valuable uses in the field of medicine. Such legal uses are carefully controlled and should only originate through your doctor. The United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics, physicians, and pharmacists all cooperate to make these controls effective and to protect you. The question is: Will you protect yourself?

There are many angles to dope addiction and everyone of them is bad. But nothing is worse than what addiction does to the human body and mind. Everyone should help to wipe out this curse of mankind.

Don't flirt with a living death.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 5, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTIC PROBLEM—TRAGEDY OF ADDICTION CENTERS ON ADOLESCENTS; ITS PREVENTION IS HAMPERED BY DISAGREEMENTS

(This is the first of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of city, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

President Eisenhower's recent order for an all-out war against illegal sale and harmful use of narcotics is a national challenge to the most vicious racket confronting the world.

This tragedy of narcotics is focused on the adolescent drug addict who takes "the monkey on his back" out of fear, and who travels a fast cycle from a "square" to a "junkie" in a few weeks.

The prevention of this tragedy is a problem for the adult community, whose intelligence is baffled by endless contradictions, and whose best efforts are harassed by the monstrous viciousness of drug racketeers.

At the heart of the problem is "the stuff"—heroin, the arch-criminal of the narcotics world. Heroin is the beginning and the end of the drug traffic in the United States, the locus of the vicious circle that entices and then enslaves its addicts.

It is "the stuff" that demands \$5 to \$50 a day from confirmed users, and returns enormous profits to its "pushers." Injected into healthy veins, "the stuff" lays waste the real world, ultimately to destroy the user. But once injected, the addict must live in dread of the day when he may not rustle his daily ration of "horse." Deprived of heroin, the addict suffers unbearable torment, and to avoid it, he will steal, mug, murder, or sell his wretched soul to buy drugs. Thus the circle turns.

Today, the drug traffic is concentrated on heroin. A century ago it was morphine. Before that it was opium itself. All of them are derived from the same source, the gentle poppy blossom, cultivated for opium seven centuries before the birth of Christ.

Morphine, an alkaloid stronger than opium, was isolated about 1805. It was found to be more stable than opium, more concentrated, more transportable. The wonder drug of the 19th century, it came fully into its own with the invention of the hypodermic syringe in 1845.

Immediately following the Civil War, addiction was known throughout the land as the Army disease. Thousands of soldiers were conditioned to morphine administered by Army surgeons and they brought their addiction home as war souvenirs. Their kinfolk were quite familiar with it, since morphine was the No. 1 drug of the 1800's.

MORPHINE WAS FASHIONABLE

It was prematurely reported to cure many ills, such as cancer, asthma, tuberculosis, and heart disease, and doctors gave syringes to their patients indiscriminately. In the eighties, from the royal courts of Europe to New York's Fifth Avenue, solid gold and silver hypodermic syringes set with jewels and diamonds were flashed. Morphine was fashionable.

By the end of the century, addiction was an acute problem. The discovery of heroin in 1898 worsened matters. Heroin, a chemical produced from morphine, serves practically the same purposes as morphine, but is more powerful and more dangerous.

Outlawed in the United States since 1925, heroin is a powerful alkaloid made by heating morphine with acetyl anhydride. The result is a dull white powder with no odor and a slightly bitter taste. It is easily made in a small laboratory. It is of little bulk, and thus it can be diluted without destroying its effect. Processing is simple, and a substantial quantity of heroin can easily

be secreted. All of these are essential factors to an illicit drug market.

Doctors prematurely hailed heroin as a cure for morphinism. When this proved not to be so, they gradually withdrew the hypos from circulation.

FOOD ACT FOLLOWED

Thereupon, the patent-medicine business took over. The patent wine tonics and pain killers were generously laced with laudanum (another opium derivative), heroin and cocaine. It is conceivable that thousands were unwitting addicts. A well-known beverage advertised, "The more you drink the more you want."

Thus was born the Pure Food and Drug Act, which curtailed the narcotic content of patent medicines and beverages by legislation in 1909.

From this point on, statistics are of little practical value. Admittedly, there were thousands of drug users who bought their supply openly at the corner pharmacy for a few pennies. There was no social stigma attached to addiction. They took their morphine in moderation, like a cocktail or two before dinner.

What happened to them with the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914 is anybody's guess. Those who were hopelessly addicted got their drugs one way or another. Unquestionably, hundreds of doctors continued to supply their old patients with heroin, winking at the law.

WAR TIMES COMPARED

When World War I came around, the United States Public Health Service estimated there was 1 addict in every 1,500 of the population. World War II figures showed 1 addict in every 10,000.

These figures were based on known users. With the changes in statistical methods, and with differing opinions, no one knows where the situation stands today. The Federal Government estimates there were from 50,000 to 60,000 addicts in the United States in 1951.

Yet, in New York, the mayor's committee on drug addiction found in the same year that there were between 45,000 and 90,000 drug slaves in the city alone; one for every 88 to 177 of the population, infants included.

Today, the sad facts of narcotics and the fight against them are these: We don't know how much heroin there is around. We don't know how many addicts we have. We don't even know how to cure them so they'll stay cured.

A VARIETY OF IDEAS

In all the confusion and contradiction, each expert has his own ideas on cause and cure, and all admit there is much for them to learn. There are as many statistics as there are statisticians.

"Drug addiction is on the downgrade." Harry J. Anslinger, the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, says so, and William Jansen, superintendent of New York City schools, is in accord.

On the other hand: "Addiction is definitely increasing." A psychiatrist at Riverside Hospital, where youthful drug addicts are treated, says so.

"There's plenty of heroin around. I wouldn't guess whether it's being used more or not." That's the opinion of a ranking official of the New York City Police Department.

"ORGANIZED CONFUSION"

"All is organized confusion when it comes to statistics," is the opinion of another official.

The experts don't even agree on what makes an addict. Expert No. 1 says: "Addiction is a primary manifestation of a character disorder . . . one element in a neurosis or psychosis . . . emotionally normal individuals seldom ever become addicted."

¹ A typhoid carrier.

But expert No. 2 says: "A majority of narcotics addicts are average individuals in their mental and moral fundamentals. Among them are many men and women of high ideals and worthy accomplishments * * * they are normal mentally and morally."

An ominous note in the present wave of addiction is the adolescent user. While this is nothing new (1920 had a wave of adolescent drug users), the alarming aspect is that we don't know where we stand.

To the questions: How are we doing today? Among users under 21, has it gone down, is it up, is it status quo?

NOBODY KNOWS

The answers are: Nobody knows, and everybody disagrees.

The official New York City Police Department figure for narcotics arrests involving persons under 21 for the first 10 months of this year is 641, according to Inspector Peter E. Terranova, head of the narcotics squad, which has recently been ordered increased from 130 to 200 members. The 641 figure compares with the arrest of 775 under 21 for the entire so-called epidemic year of 1951.

The police department asks reasonably, "How do we know whether we're catching 1 in 5 or 1 in 500? You want a figure? Pick your own. There's plenty of the stuff around—that's the only sure part of this thing."

However much they disagree on statistics, on one thing the experts agree. The problem of narcotics is as acute as ever.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—DRUG ADDICTION IN THE CITY'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPARENTLY CUT BY HEALTH EDUCATION PROGRAM

(This is the second of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

Despite contradictory and dissenting views among educators and narcotics experts, the spread of drug addiction in public schools here has apparently been checked in the last 3 years.

In 1951, during public hearings on the subject held by Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein, a witness testified that one student in every 200 in the city's schools used dope.

As a result, New York and the greater part of the country immediately began to find narcotics addicts under every bed.

HARD TO DETECT

This despite the fact that the tell-tale mark of the needle on a drug user—especially a sporadic one—is almost impossible to detect. Occasionally they even slip by the experts. Yet alarmed parents and teachers in hinterland communities began to bombard the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the United States Public Health Service.

Adolescents with a cold or hay fever, and most epileptics, were suspect. Quite a number of such cases were tracked down by teams of Government investigators. They found no dope—but they did unearth a fair-sized epidemic of adult hysteria.

Drug addiction is where the money is, and the money is in the big cities. Rural communities seldom encounter the drug-addiction problem.

What is the score on narcotics in our city's schools today?

JANSEN'S REPORT

William Jansen, superintendent of schools, says that while there were 154 drug users in the New York schools in 1951, only 27 were discovered in a survey completed this year.

This was contrary to the opinion of Attorney General Goldstein, who said: "I'll bet

that if I went into 10 schools I could come up with at least 27 narcotic users in each."

The question was put to Dr. Harold Jacobziner, in charge of child health for the department of health, who said: "It is a safe guess that there are five times the amount Mr. Jansen says. Mr. Goldstein's figure is too high."

Well, then, Dr. Jacobziner was asked, does he feel that the number of youthful users, most of whom are on "horse," or heroin, is going down?

"Unquestionably. School education on the problem has helped considerably."

Why did he say, then, that the true figure is about 5 times 27?

"We figure at the department of health that the teacher, not being a medical person, catches 1 of the 5 narcotic users."

In 1951, when Mr. Goldstein conducted his narcotic hearings, Acting Lt. Bernard M. Boylan, in charge of the New York City Police Department's narcotics squad, gave the testimony that shocked the city and the Nation.

The officer, since retired, estimated that there were 6,000 drug users under the age of 21 in the city, and that 1,500 of them were in the schools.

ONE IN EVERY TWO HUNDRED

That broke down to 1 in every 200 in the schools, a phenomenally high ratio, since it was estimated that the ratio for the entire United States population at the time was only 1 in 3,000.

Police department figures show that during the first 10 months of this year 641 persons under the age of 21 were arrested on narcotics charges. This compares with 556 for all of 1953, 552 for 1952, and 775 for 1951.

Whatever the figures, the board of education is constantly on the alert for narcotics users in the schools. Police, dressed as custodians and sometimes passing off as students, have gone into school buildings in hopes of catching and breaking up the narcotics traffic.

"They found nothing," Dr. Jansen says.

Inspector Peter E. Terranova, head of the narcotics squad, was asked if any dope users or pushers are found in or near schools these days.

MOST QUIT SCHOOL

"We find," he said, "that once a boy or girl goes on dope, they almost always drop out of school. That's why it is almost impossible to get an exact figure on how many drug users there are in the schools."

There is very little evidence to support the theory that the public school is a lab of narcotics addiction. Thousands of case histories point, rather, to small parties in homes as the scene of the first tentative experiment with drugs. The student who "takes the monkey on his back" inevitably quits school.

The adolescent may view acceptance of drugs as symbolizing sociability, solidarity with the group, defiance of adult authority. The youngster who refuses narcotics, but moves in drug-using circles, will be ridiculed for his nonconformity as a "square," "chicken," or "yellow."

EDUCATION IMPORTANT

There is, therefore, no underestimating the importance of a drug-education program in the schools. The Department of Health says so.

While the authorities may differ widely on the current number of users in the teen-age group, they are more or less agreed that there has been no perceptible rise in addiction since 1951.

In that year a hygiene program teaching the nature and effects of narcotics was instituted for use in grades 7 to 12 in those localities where it seemed advisable. Taking that on the least optimistic level, usage among adolescents has been checked.

OBJECT TO TEACHING

Yet on this as on every other level of the drug addiction problem, there is dissension. Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, and James C. Ryan, in charge of the New York district, have expressed grave objections on narcotic education in schools.

Supported by a number of powerful women's groups, Mr. Anslinger has said: "Many young persons, once their curiosity is aroused, will ignore the warning and will experiment upon themselves with disastrous results."

To which Dr. James Toolan, clinical instructor in psychiatry, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center, has replied:

"There is no indication that one single youngster has become addicted just because of the educational processes. I think the educational program has helped these youngsters."

"We should look upon this in the same way we look upon venereal disease education. The same hullabaloo was raised 25 years ago. You read reports in the literature which indicated that if you talked about venereal disease and gave sex education, every youngster in the country would go out to have sexual intercourse."

STRESSES HOW, NOT WHAT

"I think venereal disease education is an accepted procedure. * * * It is not what is taught, but how."

So far as New York is concerned, educational steps have been taken. "We are on the alert for drug users," Dr. Jansen says. "When a student is suspected, the health officer is notified immediately. We have instituted a health education program. The situation today is reasonably under control in the schools."

"But even with the reduction in known cases, there are too many in my point of view."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 7, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—RIVERSIDE HOSPITAL, OPENED IN 1952 FOR YOUNG ADDICTS, HAS HAD QUALITATIVE SUCCESS AS PIONEER FACILITY

(This is the third of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

"This small island is a playland, as they say in the newspaper, is a fine place. In my opinion, we do not appreciate it enough. The nurses and doctors take the place of our mothers and fathers. Yes, we miss our homes, but you should be aware of this: We are lucky to be here rather than in an institution of another type where the hospitality is different in many ways."

Those were the written observations of Helen, 18, one of the boys and girls being treated for drug addiction at Riverside Hospital on North Brother Island in the East River, off 138th Street, the Bronx.

The hospital, which has facilities for 110 patients, was opened in July 1952 as the Nation's only treatment and research center exclusively for drug addicts under 21 years of age. It was started in response to the widely publicized need in 1951 for such an institution, created by a startling increase in the use of narcotics by teen-agers.

A TYPICAL PATIENT

A typical patient is Jim, a tall, strapping youth of 20. He is from East Harlem, where his father is a bartender. His mother is a cook. One of six children whose ages are between 5 and 21, his homelife was a constant emotional turmoil.

Jim quit vocational high school in the second term in 1950 when he was 16 because "I just didn't like school." But he started

to use heroin before he left school. He remembers the exact date—December 23, 1949, 2 days before Christmas—when he and other boys and girls decided to have a little party.

"I felt kind of dizzy," Jim says of the first experience, which occurred in the home of one of the boys. "I got no particular enjoyment out of it. But since my friends were all using it, I kept using it, too. It gave me no worries after a while. In fact, when you're on horse, you ain't worrying about nothing—your mind is clear."

FORTY DOLLARS A DAY FOR HEROIN

He soon found himself spending \$40 a day for the drug and his only income was from helping his father at the bar. This did not come to anything like \$40 a day, so he supplemented what little he did make in the tavern by becoming a "pusher" of heroin.

"It got so," he recalls, "that guys came to me from all over the city for the stuff. I'd pay \$45 for half an ounce of 2½ percent pure and sell it to them for \$70."

But there were lean days—when he couldn't raise enough cash to buy enough for a single shot for himself.

"Three times I mugged guys," he recalls dispassionately. "I got \$87 from the first, \$42 from the second, and \$28 from the third."

He decided in 1953—after being addicted for 4 years—that he wanted to be cured. He says he was in a terrible rundown condition. He was voluntarily committed to the United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., where he remained for 135 days, he says.

"I DIDN'T LIKE IT"

"They had me there thrown in with regular prisoners of all ages," Jim says. "I didn't like it. After 135 days they said I was cured. I didn't think I was. They said I was. I came back to Harlem. Within 3 days I was using drugs again."

He was committed to Riverside at his request last July 23.

"I like it very much better here," he says. "The doctors work with you here. They show you why you use drugs and explain why it's bad. I even like going to school here. I'm taking English and math and ceramics. I ain't got no complaints. I'm willing to stay on as long as they want me to."

"You think you got this licked yet?"

"Not yet. If I go out today, I'll take some dope. I still want the stuff. The longer I stay here the more time I got to think and know more about myself. I think I can beat it."

So much for a single case. How is Riverside, more than 2 years old, working out?

QUALITATIVE SUCCESS

The Department of Hospitals, of which Riverside is a part, says it is too early to reach definite conclusions.

But Dr. Rafael R. Gamso, Riverside's medical superintendent since August 1953, has this to say:

"I think we have achieved a great degree of success—in qualitative rather than in quantitative terms."

Dr. Gamso says that a study covering the first 18 months of operations, shows that 19.3 percent of the patients treated at Riverside did not revert to drugs, 22.7 percent became readmitted or were readmitted because they were on the verge of turning to drugs again. The hospital has no information on the rest.

Many experts in the narcotics field believe that a 19.3 percent cure is unusually high and reflects credit on Riverside.

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO TREATED

A total of 632 youngsters have been admitted since July 1952, and of that number about 200 have been admitted more than once—and some two, three, and four times, pointing up what is considered the most difficult psychiatric problem.

Half the patients are self-committed—that is, by the courts through their parents—half are sent there directly by the courts after they got into trouble with the law. Of the 97 patients there as of yesterday, 82 were boys and 15 girls.

It doesn't follow that because a youth is addicted to drugs he is automatically accepted at Riverside. A screening staff will not admit a severe incorrigible, the troublemaker who can wreck the carefully planned program for other patients.

Once they are accepted, there is nothing compulsory about their staying. As Dr. Gamso says, "This is not a custodial place, not a security place. It is an open facility."

STUDIED FOR 21 DAYS

Upon admission, patients receive a physical examination and are placed in the withdrawal ward for study for 21 days.

If withdrawal symptoms appear, patients are treated by the gradual withdrawal method, with diminishing doses of a substitute drug—methadon. All patients are completely off narcotics in a few days.

After those 21 days, there is a diagnostic conference among the staff of 60 psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and social workers.

"The great majority of patients ask to leave after those first 21 days," Dr. Gamso says. "They say they have learned their lesson, that they are off drugs now and ask, 'Why should I stay here?'"

"This and other things are evaluated. We do not take what he says at face value. If, however, he is sufficiently antagonistic, we discharge him and tell him to come back if he feels he needs help. There is no black mark for the patient who leaves."

AVERAGE OF 5 MONTHS

The length of stay for those who remain beyond 21 days varies considerably with the individual, with 5 months being the average. Some have stayed as long as 15 months and bounced right back as heroin users.

Occupational therapy is stressed and there is Public School 619 on the island, setup specifically for the patients. The school, operated by the board of education under the direction of the division of child welfare, is an important part of the rehabilitation program.

Most patients, upon discharge after treatment at Riverside, are seen at an after-care clinic as often as necessary. By holding evening sessions, employment is possible for the patient, while at the same time reintegration into community life can be evaluated and any problem he meets are discussed freely.

Here is where the entire program meets its stiffest test. Has it conditioned the patient to the extent where he can go back to a squalid area—where he is constantly rubbing elbows with other drug addicts—and not be tempted all over again?

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—ADDICT'S RENEWAL OF HABIT IS MAJOR DIFFICULTY; RETURN TO ENVIRONMENT COMPLICATES TREATMENT

(This is the fourth of five articles on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

The major difficulty in the treatment of drug addiction is recidivism, or the swift relapse to the narcotics habit. Thousands of victims "kick" their habit every year. But only a handful are able to stay away from "the stuff" for good. Why?

One factor is the environment which gave the addict the solace of drugs in the first place, and to which he usually returns after his "cure." In a place like New York City's

experimental Riverside Hospital, doctors tangle directly with the problem of environment.

Practically every patient at Riverside was reared in slum areas and left school at an early age. The staff tries to explain to the patient why he began using drugs in the first place. Dr. Jerome L. Leon, Riverside's first medical superintendent, says:

"Not one of these boys has a normal emotional background. They are severely disturbed. They have family problems, work problems, sex problems. For them, drug addiction is a chemical retreat from a repugnant reality. * * *

ACHIEVE GOALS IN DREAMS

"Born and reared in the slums, with no mature goal in keeping with their training, with no good education, they can, under the influence of heroin or morphine, become lawyers, doctors, baseball stars in their opiate dreams."

What they must have is a sense of achievement—even if it comes only from drugs.

A psychiatrist with the United States Public Health Service put it this way:

"It's not easy to cure in a few months what has been building up for a lifetime."

Some experts feel that returning the cured patient to the same environment is like embarking on a long journey via a merry-go-round.

Other experts, whose patients have had some psychiatric rehabilitation and still go back to the habit, don't honestly know.

The fact is that no more than 1 in every 5 addicts take the cure once and are subsequently able to stay away from narcotics permanently.

UNBEARABLE TORMENT

Even those addicts who successfully pass through the nightmare torments of withdrawal treatment frequently revert to drugs as soon as they are given the chance.

When confirmed addicts are completely deprived of heroin, physical torment is almost unbearable. They suffer convulsions, diarrhea, and intense pain in the abdomen and back. There is nausea and vomiting, muscle twitching, clammy perspiration, and fever.

And to these torments is added sleeplessness. The skin is cold and covered with gooseflesh. It resembles that of a plucked turkey; hence the slang expression to denote complete and abrupt withdrawal from opium drugs—cold turkey.

There is a project under consideration which is held by its proponents to be a realistic approach to the problem of recidivism. Under a controlled medical-care program, addicts would continue to get as much dope as they need—from physicians—while undergoing a rehabilitation program.

If rehabilitation failed and the addict continued to be a heavy user of drugs he would still be supplied with narcotics, at a cost in pennies. The point is, according to its adherents, it would keep the addict from going to the underworld, and thus strangle the illicit drug traffic.

Dr. Hubert Shattuck Howe, a member of the New York City Welfare and Health Council's Committee on the Use of Narcotics Among Teen-Age Youth, is strongly in favor of such a project.

He feels the narcotics user is a sick person and not a criminal, and resorts to criminal practices only to maintain a habit which has become vital to his physical requirements. The person addicted to opiates is not a sex maniac. Opiate narcotics produce impotence and a complete lack of desire.

"We would endeavor," Dr. Howe says of the project he favors, "to prevent a relapse by keeping the patient under the care of a physician during the critical period when he is becoming adjusted to his resurgent sexual and other emotions which have been dulled

or warped by the drug, and now emerge with a vigor for which the addict is usually unprepared."

Chief Magistrate John M. Murtagh, who is in sympathy with such a project, feels it would be worth a try. He thinks it might make a dent in the muggings, burglary, prostitution, etc., ascribed to drug addicts.

But practically every other law enforcement official views the plan with abhorrence. They say it is similar—which its proponents say it is not—to a clinic plan which was tried and failed in New York and other cities in 1920.

A former official of the New York City Police Department says of Dr. Howe's idea: "Drug addicts are pigs. They're never satisfied. The more you give them the more they want. They'd never cut it out if it was available—psychiatrists or no. Such a plan was tried in 1920. It failed. It's a fairy tale and would never work."

Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, puts it even more succinctly:

"If a plan like that advanced by Dr. Howe is given any serious consideration at all, then a State and Federal building should be constructed. On the first floor there should be a bar for alcoholics, on the second floor a narcotic dispensary for all addicts, and on the top floor a brothel for sex deviates."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 9, 1954]

THE NATION'S NARCOTICS PROBLEM—DRYING UP SOURCE ONLY WAY TO HALT ILLICIT TRAFFIC, BUT RED CHINA, THE MAIN SUPPLIER, WON'T COOPERATE

(This is the fifth and last article in a series on narcotics and the efforts of local, State, and Federal agencies to combat the drug habit.)

(By Milton Lewis)

The youth who mugs so he can buy his capsule of heroin, the girl who sells herself to continue mainlining the drug into her scarred veins, may never be cured. But others may be spared a similar depraved state only if the world production of opium is controlled.

International cooperation—that is the one and only possible solution to the suppression of the vicious traffic in drugs.

The tale is told of the representative of one of the big opium-producing countries who was asked, "Why doesn't your country stop the traffic in drugs by controlling the growth of poppy?"

The diplomat eyed his questioner blandly. "If you can suggest another commodity which would bring in a comparable revenue, we would gladly do it."

MUST DRY UP SOURCE

Other than drying up the source, there is no effective means of stopping the illicit traffic. There are many sections of New York City where heroin can be purchased as easily as powdered sugar, which it resembles.

Additional methods are being tried and even strengthened. As a prime example, Congress this year passed Public Law 500, which gives the Government power through the Coast Guard to revoke or deny licenses of merchant marine seamen who are addicted to drugs or convicted of violations of the narcotics laws. Since merchant ships are frequently the pipe lines for opium smugglers, the Coast Guard regards this law as a major weapon in the drug war. But so long as the dope exists, the traffic probably cannot be stopped.

The reason is obvious. One kilo (35 ounces) of heroin costing about \$3,000 in Italy could eventually bring \$3 million in this country. There's enough money in this monstrous business for everyone—down to the lowliest pusher in the neighborhood.

The profits on heroin mount daily. A few years ago, 1 ounce of the pure yielded about 8,000 capsules (sold from \$1 up a cap). Today the drug is cut so heavily that profits are virtually incalculable.

How much heroin is around today? Up to September 1, some 35 kilos were seized this year. If 35 kilos were intercepted, how much slipped through undetected?

SMALL FRACTION DETECTED

At least 10 times more got through, one Federal official estimated.

"How do you arrive at that?" he was asked. "I don't know. Maybe we're catching only 1 percent instead of 10 percent. The honest answer is, I don't know."

For 45 years the United States, one of the principal targets of this scourge, has been striving to limit the production of opium to the world's medical and scientific requirements. It has met with little success, and has walked out in disgust from several international conferences.

Currently, the United Nations is trying to do something about it. It has drawn up a protocol—known as the international opium protocol—which aims at reducing the licit annual production of opium from 2,000 tons to 500 tons, which represents the medical and scientific needs of the world.

Where has the excess of 1,500 tons been going? To illegal channels and toward the enslavement of millions throughout the world.

NO CRIME MORE EVIL

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Subcommittee on International Opium Control and a member of the crime investigating committee which was headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, says:

"Of all the vicious crimes which have been studied by our crime committee—international gambling, the numbers racket, political corruption, and other crimes—there was none more evil, none more depraving, none which has done graver damage to individuals, particularly young people, than dope."

The opium protocol has been signed by 36 nations, but ratified to date by only 8. Thanks to Senator WILEY's leadership, the Senate in August ratified the protocol. Before it can go into effect, it must be ratified by at least 25 nations, including 3 which produce opium, from which heroin is derived.

RED CHINA MAIN PROBLEM

Under the protocol, only seven countries would be permitted to export raw opium—Turkey, Iran, India, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Russia. None of these has yet ratified the protocol.

Of the seven, the principal overproduction has been taking place in Turkey, Iran, and India, according to Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics and since 1946 a member of the U. N. Narcotics Commission.

But by far the major source of illicit traffic for the entire world is Red China, Mr. Anslinger says.

Even if Turkey, Iran, and India—which harvest most of the 2,000 tons annually—were to reduce their production by 75 percent, there still remains the problem of Red China, Mr. Anslinger notes.

THE WORST OFFENDER

"I do not believe," he says, "they (Red China) have any place in the U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, because certainly they are the worst offender. Red China represents the major source of illicit traffic for the entire world, and there appears to be no intention to carry out the obligations which the Nationalist Government undertook."

"The Nationalist government was doing a splendid job in reducing opium production. There was very little heroin that came out of China while they were in power and every

year the Nationalist government executed about 1,000 drug peddlers. I have not heard of any executions under the present regime. If anything, the trade is encouraged."

"Southeast Asia is flooded with opium from Yunnan. Japan today is suffering from the greatest flood of heroin in her history. * * * A lot of it from Red China is reaching the United States. A lot of it is coming into California."

REDS SPREAD POISON

"* * * The amount of heroin that is flowing out of China is used for several purposes; to obtain foreign exchange (it is a very good means of obtaining foreign exchange, since they cannot export other commodities) and also the demoralization of people who use this deadly drug in many countries. That is certainly one of the objectives—you cannot get away from that—a poison being spread from Red China."

"We have brought this matter up before the Commission on Narcotics Drugs in the United Nations repeatedly. We have had one note from the Communist government which was submitted through the Soviet delegation. Their only answer to many, many charges, well documented, was that they prohibited the production of opium."

"That is about as far as they answered, except to say that it was just slanderous to make those assertions. However, in the United Nations documents submitted by most of the governments who suffer from this terrible scourge, especially Burma, Malaya, Indochina, Indonesia and Thailand, these governments openly state the source of this heroin is the Chinese mainland."

NO LEAKAGE FROM THE SOVIETS

Has there been any cooperation by the Kremlin to stop this nefarious business?

"Not insofar as the Chinese mainland is concerned," Mr. Anslinger says. "The Soviet orbit, that is, Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, do carry out their obligations. We do not find any leakage from the Soviet orbit. It is all from the Chinese mainland, and there is evidently no effort whatever to stop this traffic."

It is Mr. Anslinger's view that if the three large countries where opium production is legal—Turkey, Iran, and India—would agree to reduce their production as a result of this protocol we would be that much better off and then we can devote most of our efforts to this smuggling from the Far East.

MANY NONSIGNATORIES

Specifically, the protocol would require countries to provide estimates of their needs and statistics covering their trade in opium. Its effectiveness, of course, will depend on the good faith of the nations of the world.

"Numerous nations," Senator WILEY notes, "are not signatories at all to the protocol, although there is machinery available in the protocol to help assure compliance by those nonparticipating states."

"Each of those nations must recognize that they must answer before the world if they fail to abide by the international opium effort."

Red China, Senator WILEY believes, will continue openly to flout, as it has been flouting, the conscience of mankind by its vicious opium peddling.

As to the protocol itself, Senator WILEY says:

"If nations refuse to honor their formal or informal obligations; if they refuse to make accurate, complete, and prompt reports regarding narcotics within their area; if they fail to crack down upon narcotics offenders in their midst; if they in any way prove the weak link in the world-wide enforcement chain against criminals, then the chain will snap."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the distinguished

junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] in the introduction today of the narcotics control bill.

As one who has worked in the field of criminal law administration, I think there can be no doubt about the fact that the narcotics problem in the United States is one of the causes of serious juvenile delinquency. I think that Congress, at this session, has a clear public duty to proceed to enact legislation along the lines of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maine, so that we can bring under more effective control the traffic in narcotics in the United States.

FAMILY-FARM BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to set forth some guideposts toward achieving that policy. Because some other Senators have expressed interest in the same objectives, I ask that the joint resolution lie over for 1 legislative day, for the benefit of any other Senators who may care to join as cosponsors.

Since the earliest days of the Republic, the family-farm pattern of American agriculture has been considered as essential to a strong democracy, and the policy of the Nation has been to favor the establishment and preservation of family-owned and family-operated farms.

In this period of reexamination of farm programs and farm legislation, it should be useful to look first at the objectives we intend to serve, and to establish some policy guideposts against which all proposed farm legislation can be appraised for its usefulness in achieving our national objectives.

Ample precedent for establishing goals in the national interest as policy guides, and then reviewing our progress toward them, has been established in the Employment Act of 1946, a measure to encourage an expanding economy assuring full employment.

A desirable pattern of sound and prospering agriculture is closely related to the objective of a sound national economy, and is necessary to maintain full employment.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

Mr. President, because some other Senators have expressed interest in the same objectives, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk until the next legislative day, in order to provide other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[The joint resolution will appear hereafter in the RECORD.]

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the very nature of the Central Intelligence Agency I think it is imperative that a joint congressional committee be established for the purpose of making continued studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and problems related to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security. I feel that there should be a joint congressional committee authorized, and that the CIA should, as a matter of law, keep that committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

The need for the Central Intelligence Agency is seldom questioned any longer and I certainly am not challenging it now. What I am concerned with, however, is CIA's position of responsibility to none but the National Security Council. I believe this should be changed. It is true that intelligence services of other major countries operate without direct control of the legislatures. This is understandable in a totalitarian government, such as the Soviet Union. It is even understandable in a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain where the entire administration is a part of and is responsible to Parliament. Our form of government, however, is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system becomes seriously out of balance at any point the whole system is jeopardized and the way is opened for the growth of tyranny.

There has been almost no congressional inspection of the Central Intelligence Agency since its establishment in 1947. It is conceivable that as the need for an intelligence service had been evident in 1946, the Congressional Reorganization Act of that year would have made provisions for congressional participation in the committee structure of Congress. As it is now, however, CIA is freed from practically every ordinary form of congressional check. Control of its expenditures is exempted from the provisions of law which prevent financial abuses in other Government agencies. Each year only a handful of Members in each House see the appropriation figures. There is no regular, methodical review of this Agency, other than a briefing which is supplied to a few Members of selected subcommittees.

I agree that in order to be effective an intelligence agency must maintain complete secrecy. If clandestine sources of information were inadvertently revealed, they would quickly dry up. Not only would the flow of information be cut off, but the lives of many would be seriously endangered. In addition, much of the value of the intelligence product would be lost if it were known that we possessed it. Secrecy for these purposes is obviously necessary.

However, there is a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Once secrecy becomes sacrosanct, it invites abuse. If we accept the idea of secrecy for secrecy's sake we will have no way of knowing whether we have a fine intelligence service or a very poor one.

If a joint committee is set up as proposed in the concurrent resolution I am about to submit, all bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or in the House of Representatives relating primarily to the CIA, would be referred to the joint committee; and the joint committee would, from time to time, make whatever reports are necessary to the Congress concerning its relationship with the CIA.

This resolution would establish a joint committee, composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance, not more than 4 Members would be of the same political party.

The joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof would be authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it might deem advisable. The committee, in addition, would be empowered to appoint its staff; and would be authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the CIA is in somewhat the same category as the Atomic Energy Commission; and just as a special committee, with well defined authority and powers has been created on a joint congressional basis to oversee and supervise the interests of the AEC, so I believe should a joint congressional committee be created for the same purpose in connection with the CIA. I realize full well, because of the very nature of the duties of the CIA, that there has been no public scrutiny of its activities. This may be necessary in this day and age, but I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the purpose of seeing that good management is maintained in the CIA and also to keep a constant check on its intelligence policies. It is well, too, that this joint committee should be in a posi-

tion to criticize any mistakes which the CIA may make.

Until a committee of the kind I am proposing is established, there will be no way of knowing what serious flaws in the Central Intelligence Agency may be covered by the curtain of secrecy by which it is shrouded. In 1949 the Hoover Commission examined the CIA. A task force stated that—

The Central Intelligence Agency has not yet achieved the desired degree of proficiency and dependability in its estimates. Without it, the National Security Council cannot succeed in assessing and appraising the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our * * * military power, with sufficient continuity or definiteness to constitute a practical guide to the Military Establishment as to the size of our military needs.

It recommended that vigorous steps be taken to improve the Central Intelligence Agency and its work.

The purpose of the joint congressional committee would be in a sense to safeguard as well as to supervise the policies of the CIA. In my opinion the Congress should, because of the very nature of the work of the CIA, do everything in its power to protect its activities, to make it impossible for the CIA, as an organization, to lose its effectiveness, and to enable it to continue its extremely important work in such a manner as to warrant the necessary amount of freedom of activity and the necessary security to perform the duties allocated to it under the law.

Mr. President, if a joint committee is established, CIA officials will no longer be defenseless against criticism because their lips are sealed. They will have a congressional channel to turn to. The joint committee, in turn, could maintain the confidence of Congress and the public, without loss of security.

To this end, Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Florida

[Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee on Central Intelligence, and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than 4 members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such ex-

penditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report executive hearing shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$ per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution embodying a code of fair procedures for Senate investigations. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 22), submitted by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by deleting the title "Standing Committees" and inserting in lieu thereof "Senate Committees", and by inserting at the end of such rule the following:

"5. The following shall be the rules of the standing, select, and special committees of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and subcommittees thereof, and the term 'committee' as used in this subsection (except in paragraphs (a) (7) and (b) (1)) means any such committee or subcommittee:

"(a) (1) Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

"(2) Unless otherwise provided, committee action shall be by vote of a majority of a quorum.

"(3) No committee hearing shall be held in any place outside the District of Columbia unless authorized by the committee.

"(4) All hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee orders an executive session.

"(5) No measure, finding, or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

"(6) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way

of summary, unless authorized by the committee.

"(7) A subcommittee of any standing, select, or special committee may be authorized only by a majority vote of the members of such committee.

"(8) Authority to issue subpoenas may be delegated to the chairman or any member by the committee at a meeting called for such purpose.

"(9) A majority of the members of a committee may call a special meeting of such committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, who shall notify each member.

"(10) The professional and clerical staff personnel of each committee shall be appointed, and services of such staff personnel terminated, by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"(b) (1) No committee or subcommittee investigation shall be initiated unless specifically authorized by the Senate or by the standing, select, or special committee having jurisdiction.

"(2) The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest date practicable, report to the Senate the general nature of inquiries or investigations the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case in which he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall in writing advise the President of the Senate of that fact.

"(3) The chairman or one of the members of a committee shall when practicable consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(4) In any investigation in which witnesses have been subpoenaed, requests to subpoena additional witnesses shall be received and considered by the chairman of the committee, except that in any investigation where the provisions of paragraphs (d) or (e) apply, any such request from a witness or other person exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination in such investigation shall be considered and acted upon by the committee at the earliest date practicable.

"(5) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein.

"(c) (1) No subpoenaed witness shall be required to testify before a committee with less than 2 members present, unless the committee decides that 1 member may hold the hearing, or the witness waives any objection to testifying before 1 member.

"(2) The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted, on behalf of the committee, by members and authorized staff personnel only.

"(3) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during a hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

"(4) Witnesses shall be permitted to be advised by counsel of their legal rights while giving testimony, and, unless the presiding member of the committee otherwise directs, to be accompanied by counsel at the stand. A witness may be deemed to have waived this right if, after receiving timely notice of his appearance, he fails to provide himself with counsel.

"(5) Witnesses, counsel, and other persons present at committee hearings shall maintain proper order and decorum. Counsel shall observe the standards of ethics and deportment generally required of attorneys at law.

"(6) Witnesses at committee hearings shall be required, so far as practicable, to submit written statements of their proposed

testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"(d) Whenever a committee determines that evidence relating to a question under investigation may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons called as witnesses therein, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"(1) Preliminary staff inquiries in such investigation may be directed by the chairman, but no witnesses shall be called to testify until approved by the committee.

"(2) All testimony, whether given under subpoena or voluntarily, shall be given under oath.

"(3) Counsel for a witness may be permitted, in the discretion of the presiding member at any hearing and as justice may require, to be heard briefly on points of right and procedure, to examine his client briefly for purposes of amplification and clarification, and to address pertinent questions by written interrogatory to other witnesses whose testimony pertains to his client.

"(4) Testimony shall be heard in executive session when necessary to shield a witness or other person about whom he may testify.

"(5) The secrecy of executive sessions and of all matters and material not expressly released by the committee shall be rigorously enforced.

"(6) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit concise, pertinent, oral, or written statements relating to their testimony for inclusion in the record at the opening or close of such testimony.

"(7) An accurate verbatim transcript shall be made of all testimony, and no alterations other than to correct clerical errors shall be permitted therein.

"(8) Each witness may obtain transcript copies of his testimony given publicly by paying the cost thereof. Copies of his testimony given in executive session shall be furnished a witness at cost if the testimony has been released or publicly disclosed, or if the chairman of the committee so orders.

"(9) No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly disclosed in part only, except when the committee decides that deletions from the transcript are required by considerations of national security.

"(e) Whenever a committee determines that any testimony, statement, release, or other evidence or utterance relating to a question under investigation tends to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons who are not witnesses, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable and necessary, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"(1) Persons so exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination shall be afforded an opportunity to appear as witnesses, promptly and if possible at the same time such evidence or utterance is given, and under subpoena if they so elect. Testimony relating to such adverse evidence or utterance shall be subject to the applicable provisions of paragraph (d) of this subsection. Any such person may, in lieu of appearing as a witness, submit a concise, pertinent sworn statement which shall be incorporated in the record of the hearing at which the adverse evidence or utterance was submitted.

"(f) Vouchers covering investigating expenditures of any committee shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the chairman of such committee that the investigation was duly authorized and conducted under the provisions of this subsection.

"6. In any case in which a controversy arises between committees as to the jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate to make any inquiry or investigation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the

Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal. Such decision finally arrived at, with or without appeal, shall not operate to invalidate proceedings of the committee prior thereto."

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am submitting for appropriate reference a resolution embodying a code of fair procedures for Senate investigations. I am pleased to have the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] join me in sponsorship.

The problem of providing fair treatment for witnesses and other persons affected by Senate investigations without crippling the Senate's essential power to investigate has been under intensive study for many months.

Since May 24, 1954, when I introduced my first draft of a code of fair procedures, as Senate Resolution 253, many recommendations for additions to the Senate rules have been made.

Most recent of these were the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Rules of the 83d Congress, introduced in the present session as Senate Resolution 17, and based on hearings at which all points of view were thoroughly explored.

In examining the report of the Subcommittee on Rules, it has seemed to me that its recommendations give too few rights to witnesses and other persons who may be exposed to defamation, degradation, and incrimination during the course of Senate investigations.

It is possible to go too far in the other direction, as some have proposed, and have a set of rules which would entangle committees in crippling legalisms and redtape which would seriously interfere with, if not stultify, the work of investigating committees.

The resolution introduced by myself and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] seeks a sound course between the two extremes. Drawn upon suggestions originally contained in Senate Resolution 253 and upon the recommendations of the select committee in the 83d Congress headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and those of the Subcommittee on Rules, we have attempted to draft a comprehensive code which will preserve the Senate's essential power to investigate and at the same time give to witnesses and others affected the basic protections demanded by the American sense of justice and fair play.

We must maintain and strengthen the weapons of the Senate to ferret out subversives, while respecting the rights of decent citizens who appear before investigating committees.

During the past session many Senators expressed their support, in principle, for fair investigating procedures. The time has now come for action. I hope that the Senate will proceed promptly to set its house in order.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, first of all I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear in the Record following those of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who earlier today submitted a resolution proposing new Senate rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity of joining my colleague from Connecticut in submitting this resolution, which will provide a specific and long-overdue set of rules of procedure for Senate committees.

These rules, which embody suggestions from a wide range of sources, will safeguard the rights and prerogatives of the Senate, and at the same time will protect the rights and interests of citizens who may appear before our committees.

The need for such a code has long been apparent. During the 2 years I have been a Member of this body, I have on occasions been horrified at the lack of such rules and at the abuses which have occurred as a consequence. I have seen committed against individuals, and also against the committees of the Senate offenses which would be definitely discouraged and in many situations punishable if such rules were in effect.

The power of investigations by both branches of Congress is essential to good government. However, we should exercise this power with a sense of justice and decency. Our responsibilities in this regard have multiplied tremendously in recent years. With our present complex civilization and the ramifications of government, Congress looks into actions and problems affecting nearly every segment of American life.

Our committees should have all the necessary authority to carry out effectively and relentlessly the necessary inquiries and investigations.

At the same time, they must not degenerate into witch hunts or inquisitions. On the other hand, our committees should not be turned into forums for character assassins, for paying off grudges, and for obtaining self-serving publicity.

During the past 2 years I was deeply distressed at some spectacles which characterized the operations of some of our committees. I cannot condone the maligning of distinguished citizens by axe-grinding individuals—one instance of which occurred before my own eyes—who obtain the use of Senate bodies as sounding boards. Nor can I shrug off the "leaking" of confidential information and secret testimony, in a manner which gives the public wrong impressions and incomplete pictures of conditions.

There are many valuable and constructive features of the proposed code of procedure. I wish to point to a few which seem to me to be extremely desirable.

The restrictions on one-man subcommittees and the requirements that various actions must be by majority vote are imperative to preserving the dignity of this body, assuring well-balanced inquiries, and avoiding unfair treatment of citizens. The right of injured persons, particularly third parties, to defend themselves in thorough accord with traditional American concepts of fair play. The details of the proposed rule on committee hearings will elevate the character of our operations, prevent obstructionism such as tried the patience of Judge Medina in the important Communist case, and assure the integrity of executive proceedings.

I am convinced of the need for such rules. Whether they are called reforms or remedies is immaterial to me. They will set forth positively our right to de-

mand and to get facts, but will make sure that both our committees and persons appearing before them, either voluntarily or under compulsion, will conduct themselves in the cherished American way.

Our proposal admittedly will not cover every situation which conceivably could arise. Perhaps other points which should be covered will be suggested. This resolution is easily susceptible of amendment. At the least, Mr. President, it proposes a concrete step toward achieving a goal which, to my mind, the Senate should make every effort to reach with the least delay.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 289, 83d Congress, relating to holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and pursuant to its jurisdiction under rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, agreed to August 11, 1954, is hereby increased by \$33,000, and such sum, together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before January 31, 1956.

MARKING WITH COLORED STRIPES OF TAX FORMS MAILED TO TAXPAYERS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPF], I submit for appropriate reference the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the marking of tax forms being mailed to taxpayers with colored stripes to designate the amount of the taxpayers' liability is a violation of the intent of section 7213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall be so notified.

There has been much concern expressed that the Treasury Department has adopted the policy of marking tax forms being sent through the mail in a prominent manner which would give information as to the amount of the taxpayer's liability of the previous year.

These tax forms, so prominently marked on the outside and distributed through the mails, can readily be observed and understood not only by the postal clerks but also by any neighbor or visitor in the home or office at the time the mail is delivered.

I can think of no possible justification for this wholesale disclosure of the tax liability of the American citizens by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I shall urge the Senate Finance Committee to

give prompt consideration to this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Record a letter from Commissioner Andrews explaining the position of the Internal Revenue Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY
DEPARTMENT,

Washington, November 19, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This matter of distinctive marking of tax packages, to which you referred in your letter of November 1, 1954, has been considerably distorted in some of the newspaper and other reports. Too, no doubt, the subject seems to have gotten kicked around for a few days in the dying days of the recent political campaign when there was some competition among candidates for quotable headlines.

If others could put it down, as I am doing as this is being written, and look at the packages of last year's forms as compared with this year's, they would see how grossly out of focus this whole matter has become in a few quarters. In this year's group we have four packages of the same size with no descriptive information appearing on the outside except a uniformly placed and printed index of contents and the colored stripe which indicates the broadest categories of tax returns. On the other hand, we had 5 separate packages last year printed on 4 different types of paper with 3 different colors of ink being used and 3 different colors of paper being used. Moreover, there were 3 different colors of seals being used to close the packages and last year's packages themselves contained statements, on the front and in bold type as large as 72 point, as to their contents and purposes.

We have received in the national office approximately 90 letters of comment from taxpayers concerning distinctive markings and there is quoted below the entire text of the letter we are using in reply to these communications:

"The Internal Revenue Service has for a number of years followed the practice of marking its tax packages in a distinctive manner as an aid in the economical and efficient handling of tax forms. Since we must print, segregate by tax categories, address and mail in excess of 50 million of these tax packages each year, it is necessary for us to use every means available to us to accomplish this task as rapidly and as cheaply as possible.

"The distinctive marking has been achieved in the past through the use of different sizes and colors of paper, by specially designed symbols, and in other ways. This year we are using a colored stripe across the package to distinguish the forms to be sent to farmers, businessmen, other taxpayers likely under the law to be required to file declarations of estimated tax, and taxpayers not likely to file such declarations. Declarations of estimated tax are required, under the law, not only from taxpayers with income in excess of \$10,000, but also certain other taxpayers who are single, file separately from husbands or wives, have investment income, or have income in excess of \$100 not subject to the withholding provisions of the tax law. Therefore, the most practical

course open to us was to send packages containing the declaration forms to all businessmen and farmers, regardless of income and to others with incomes above \$10,000, and the identification markings were necessary in order to assure mailing the right kinds of packages to all taxpayers.

"All of us here in the Internal Revenue Service are anxious to guard the privacy of tax returns, and take every reasonable step to that end. At the same time, it must be recognized that the mailing of blank returns of any kind is in itself some indication of tax status. For example, in the past the separate mailing of the blank forms for declaration of estimated income tax indicated the previous year's tax status of the taxpayer. On the other hand, it is absolutely necessary that taxpayers be furnished the blank return forms which they need.

"Thank you for your recent communication on this subject and for your interest in the Internal Revenue Service."

While the matter of 52 million tax packages no doubt makes good copy from the newsman's viewpoint there is actually very little likelihood that any close approximation of an individual's income can be gained from observation of this year's tax package. Moreover, the fact that we have received so few communications may be indicative of the general reaction to the wide publicity given this matter.

Sincerely yours,

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from January 31, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

SEVERANCE OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution favoring severance of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and satellites and the calling of an international conference to combat communism. I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me in the Senate on May 13, 1954, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That (1) whereas it is morally wrong for the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws who, by stealth and ruthless power, have enslaved one-third of the people of the world; and whereas the outposts and advance posi-

tions of this outlaw band, received and tolerated under the guise of diplomatic missions, in the United States and other countries of the free world are in fact nests of espionage, seditious propaganda, and sabotage: Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the alleged Government of Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged Government of Soviet Russia.

(2) Whereas the tentacles of international communism are everreaching for new areas of conquest, and this spreading menace can be effectively combated only by concerted action of the free nations: Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should convoke an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and (b) to resist further aggression by international communism.

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution relating to severance of diplomatic relations with Russia, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement pertaining to the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That—

"(1) Whereas it is morally wrong for the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws who, by stealth and ruthless power, have enslaved one-third of the people of the world; and whereas, the outposts and advance positions of this outlaw band, received and tolerated under the guise of diplomatic missions, in the United States and other countries of the free world are in fact nests of espionage, seditious propaganda, and sabotage; therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the alleged Government of Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged Government of Soviet Russia.

"(2) Whereas the tentacles of international communism are ever reaching for new areas of conquest, and this spreading menace can be effectively combated only by concerted action of the free nations; therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should convoke an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and (b) to resist further aggression by international communism."

The statement presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

"In an official note to the then President of the United States on November 16, 1933, as a prelude to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Maxim Litvinoff, who was People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, pledged the Soviet Government:

"1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its

own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

"2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in government service and all organizations of the government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions.

"3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which makes claim to be the government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its Territories or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support, or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its Territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions."

"On the same day, November 16, 1933, the then President of the United States accepted this pledge of the Soviet Government and diplomatic relations were established between the governments of the two countries.

"Long before that fateful day, the Communist manifesto had announced:

"In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. * * *

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

"Long before that fateful day, Nicoli Lenin himself had proclaimed:

"The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

"In the face of this record of the aims and objectives of the Soviet Union, was the pledge given to our Government on November 16, 1933, to be believed and accepted in good faith?

"Let us turn again to the writings of Lenin himself:

"We must be able to withstand all this, to agree to all and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to various stratagems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges."

"A moment's reflection on the treachery which spawned the infamous, Godless tyranny that was then just beginning to whet its appetite for the enslavement of all humanity should have given pause.

"A glance at the Soviet Union's record as a consistent violator of international commit-

ments and pacts prior to November 1933, should have prompted hesitation.

"In spite of these grim warnings, our Government not only established diplomatic relations with the dictators of the Kremlin but, since then, has fed their conspiratorial apparatus with billions of our wealth, with concessions, and appeasements ad nauseam.

"Did the Soviet Union keep its pledge to the Government of the United States? Here are the words of William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party in the United States:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the government will not be a capitalist government but a Soviet Government and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"On September 30, 1950, the Congress, after years of investigation, inquiry, and direct observation, legislatively declared:

"There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is * * * to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a worldwide Communist organization.

"The Communist organization in the United States, pursuing its stated objectives, the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries, and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself, presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions."

"Today, we read the gruesome record of this monster which is written in the blood of its victims and we are appalled by its insatiable appetite. It has devoured untold millions of human souls. It grips millions more who are wasting to an angonizing death in slave-labor camps.

"Today, there are some 20 million agents of this conspiracy against humanity itself spread out in a deadly fifth column encompassing the globe.

"Today, there are legions of worldwide interlocking nerve centers for espionage, sabotage, and subversion, masquerading as diplomatic establishments, under the discipline of the masters of the Kremlin.

"Today, the awful truth is that the tentacles of this Red octopus embrace one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of the world's land surface, and these tentacles are reaching to encompass the globe.

"The Senate resolution calls for the severance of diplomatic relations with the Kremlin and with these governments which are satellites of the Kremlin.

"The conscious of the world demands that this Nation, as the last great bastion of freedom, take the lead in expelling from the family of nations the tyrants of Moscow. This course of action would give notice to the enslaved peoples of the world, and those who are threatened with enslavement, that we will no longer welcome their vile oppressors at the council tables of the world to spew forth their venom in mockery of men of good will.

"We can no longer blind ourselves to the fact that there can be no binding agreement or solemn pact with men who know no morality and whose only god is naked, brute force.

"This course of action is likewise impelled by the grim necessity to protect ourselves against the penetration of this country by the master plotters, in the guise of diplomats.

"The Senate resolution also calls for the convoking of an international conference of the free nations of the world for the purpose of agreeing upon united action (a) to destroy the Communist fifth column, and

(b) to resist further aggression by international communism.

"Although the Communist world is welded in a unity of steel, division and disunity characterize the nations which have not succumbed to the aggression of the Kremlin. A startling fact is that the Moscow trade offensive has penetrated deep into the economic life of the free world with the result that there are currently being drawn into the Communist orbit the economic systems of the free nations. This means not only a transfusion of the strength of the free world into the Iron Curtain countries but eventual economic strangulation of the West.

"Those nations which are yet free must, before it is too late, choose up sides and declare themselves for united action to quarantine the marauding fanatics who threaten to destroy civilization itself.

"It is hoped that the Senate resolution will have wide circulation and discussion. It offers a vehicle for the formulation of one overall policy to strengthen ourselves and the free world against the deadly impending peril."

STUDY OF LEASING OF SPACE OR BUILDINGS FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution which I ask to be referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ask unanimous consent that the statement attached thereto may be printed in full in the RECORD. It simply relates to the matter of various Government agencies, bureaus, and commissions renting a great deal of office space in towns where, as a matter of fact, there are Federal buildings available to house Government projects. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me regarding the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was received and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the leasing of space or buildings by agencies, bureaus, departments, and commissions of the United States Government. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent to which space or buildings have been leased at exorbitant rates, (2) determining the extent to which political connections have figured in the leasing of space or buildings, (3) determining the extent to which space or buildings not fireproof have been leased when comparable space in fireproof buildings could have been leased at equal or lower rates, (4) determining the extent to which attempts have been made to locate various agencies, bureaus, and commissions in one building for administrative convenience and for the convenience of the public, and (5) determining the extent to which buildings already owned by the Government have been utilized before space or buildings were leased on a rental basis.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than March 1, 1956.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Allegations have been made to me which suggest that inefficiency and unwarranted favoritism have been displayed in the securing of quarters for agencies and bureaus of the Federal Government. Such allegations have come from what I consider credible sources and I cannot therefore perfunctorily dismiss them as I might some uncorroborated rumor. In submitting this resolution calling for a thorough study and exposé of the truth or falsity of these allegations, I do not seek to impugn anyone. I am interested only in securing the facts, whatever they might be, which will either set these allegations to rest or result in the establishment of efficiency and impartiality in this large Federal program.

In addition, the resolution also provides a means by which the Congress may obtain information concerning the method, practice, and procedure by which space is obtained for Government agencies. It is certainly important to know whether the convenience of the public is being served on a businesslike basis in this program as it should be in all others.

In my judgment, the committee best equipped for this task is the Committee on Government Operations and I have therefore phrased this resolution accordingly.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 23) to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT SCHWEITZER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a brief word with regard to an important anniversary which occurs today. It is the 80th birthday of one of the world's greatest men. I refer to the noted philosopher, musician, missionary, physician, spiritual leader—Dr. Albert Schweitzer.

Throughout the world, men and women of all creeds, of all nationalities, of all colors, have been thrilled by his selfless dedication to the cause of humanity. He makes us all humble before his magnificent demonstration in the heart of Africa of the brotherhood of man.

I believe, therefore, that it is altogether appropriate that, from the floor of the Senate to Lambarene, French Equatorial Africa, I send to him greetings and best wishes, which I know are shared by my colleagues and by the American people as a whole.

I send now to the desk the text of a brief article which appears in the current issue of the Saturday Review. It consists of a few inspiring excerpts from a book being issued today by Harper's entitled "The World of Albert Schweitzer," with photographs by Erica Anderson and text and captions by Eugene Exman.

I understand that this book has been described by the editor of the Saturday Review, Mr. Norman Cousins, as the most intimate and most knowledgeable personal portrait yet to appear of the man who is widely regarded as the greatest nonpolitical figure of our age.

Other splendid books have been published by the MacMillan Co., Beacon Press, and other sources, regarding this great individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from the Saturday Review be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER

"Life here is not so romantic as most people think it is," Dr. Schweitzer once told a visitor. "To be a success in Lambarene you must be a carpenter, a mechanic, a farmer, a boatman, a trader, as well as a physician and surgeon."

Lambarene, of course, is a village in the Gabon Province of French Equatorial Africa. Here, on the banks of the Ogowe River, Dr. Albert Schweitzer came in 1913 to establish a hospital. To this remote hospital the world has since built a well-beaten path.

Albert Schweitzer's fame, however, is not due simply to his having established a hospital in an equatorial jungle. Other doctors have built hospitals—sometimes better equipped—in far countries, yet their work is relatively unknown. Dr. Schweitzer's significance lies in the extent of his exceptional gifts—native endowments, perhaps, but dedication to a common end. He is a doctor of medicine and also a doctor of music, of philosophy, and of theology. He is the author of books in all these fields, translated into many languages. When he was 8 years old he began to play the organ and at 9 he was able to substitute for the regular organist at church services. He prepared for the university at Mulhausen Gymnasium, where he developed a keen interest in history and natural science. But it was to his trinity of interest—musical theory, philosophy, and theology—that he devoted most of his time at Strasbourg University. His philosophical thought has profoundly influenced two generations.

Happiness filled all of Schweitzer's early life. His interest in music, philosophy, and theology may be partially accounted for by inheritance; both of his grandfathers were organists and one was also a schoolmaster, and his father was a leading Alsatian pastor. But for the young Schweitzer happiness was the twin of shared pain. As he says, "Whoever is spared personal pain must feel himself called to help in diminishing the pain of others. We must all carry our share of the misery which lies upon the world."

In 1896, when he was 21, he determined that he should live for science and art until he was 30, and after that give his talents to the direct service of humanity. When this time came he was already one of the finest organists in Europe, and principal of the Theological College of St. Thomas, Strasbourg; famous friends like the organist, Widor, his teacher, and writer, Romain Rolland, protested that he would take his great gifts to the wilderness of Equatorial Africa.

His will was firm, however, and he plunged into medicine. By 1913 he was ready to go.

Since he has been in Lambarene his work has been impeded many times by wars and insufficient funds. And the medical needs of Africa are bottomless. Several times Dr. Schweitzer has had to return to Europe, to write books, lecture, or perform in concert in order to earn the funds necessary to keep his hospital out of the arms of the encircling jungles. He himself has endured sickness, ulcerated feet, and the unpredictable rains and exasperating folkways of primeval Africa. One may imagine that such a sensitive and disciplined man has had many moments of doubt; however this may be, he has never ceased to work, in the most practical ways, for the health and understanding of his beloved Africans, in that continent which is now his second home.

In Schweitzer's own words:

"I wanted to be a doctor that I might be able to work without having to talk. For years I had been giving myself out in words * * * this new form of activity I could not represent to myself as talking about the religion of love, but only as an actual putting it into practice."

"Only at quite rare moments have I felt really glad to be alive. I could not but feel with a sympathy full of regret all the pain that I saw around me, not only that of men but that of the whole creation. From this community of suffering I have never tried to withdraw myself. It seemed to me a matter of course that we should all take our share of the burden of pain which lies upon the world."

"It was quite incomprehensible to me—this was before I began going to school—why in my evening prayers I should pray for human beings only. So when my mother had prayed with me and had kissed me good-night I used to add silently a prayer that I had composed myself for all living creatures. It ran thus: 'O, Heavenly Father, protect and bless all things that have breath; guard them from all evil and let them sleep in peace.'"

"Truth has no special time of its own. Its hour is now—always."

"People say I understand something about music, but the sweetest sound I have ever heard came from a room one night when from the change in a baby's crying I knew that the crisis had passed, and that he would be well again."

"Those who have learned by experience what physical pain and bodily anguish mean belong together all the world over; they are united by a secret bond. One and all, they know the horrors of suffering to which man can be exposed, and one and all they know the longing to be free from pain."

"He speaks to us the same word: 'Follow thou me!' and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfill for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who He is."

"An organ is like a cow; its does not look at its horns so much as at its milk."

"Joy, sorrow, tears, lamentation, laughter—to all these music gives voice, but in such a way that we are transported from the world of unrest to a world of peace, and see reality in a new way, as if we were sitting by a mountain lake and contemplating hills and woods and clouds in the tranquil and fathomless water."

ALBERT SCHWEITZER'S CAREERS

Music: Eugene Munch, 1857-98, a biography of his friend and first organ teacher. J. S. Bach, a huge, two-volume biography of the giant Baroque composer. Many organ recordings, some made in Europe in order to buy medicaments for the Lambarene hospital. Also a book on organs and organ

building, and an edition of Bach's organ works (with Widor). Dr. Schweitzer still practices regularly on a special, termite-proof organ donated by European friends.

Theology: The Quest of the Historical Jesus (1906), which sums up the work of 200 years of Biblical higher criticism, and provides an original interpretation of many textual problems in Scripture, has been called the most influential book of theology published in this century. He has also written two books on Paul, a psychiatric study of Jesus (written for his doctor-of-medicine thesis), and Christianity and the Religions of the World. Dr. Schweitzer is himself a preacher; during World War I he preached in Strasbourg, and he preaches regularly to his staff and patients in Africa.

Philosophy: His autobiographical works include Out of My Life and Thought, On the Edge of the Primeval Forest, and Memoirs of Childhood and Youth. He has also written, partly from lectures given over Europe, the two-volume Philosophy of Civilization. He has won innumerable medals, prizes, and honors from all over the earth, and the Nobel Peace Prize for 1952.

Medicine: The hospital plant at Lambarene has had to be moved physically and rebuilt several times. In addition to common conditions, Schweitzer must treat tropical scourges like epidemics of amebic and bacillary dysentery, malaria (almost all his patients have this), strangulated hernia, elephantiasis, leprosy, etc. Many Africans also suffer from severe nutritional deficiencies which may be responsible for the prevalence of (uncancerous) tumor.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THOUGHT

Rational thought is important for its own sake and as it leads to a higher form which Schweitzer calls mystical thought. Pure reason can carry us only so far; to penetrate further we must quiet the mind and await the insight for which reason has prepared us.

This higher thought may contradict the expectations of logical, rational thought. Perhaps that is why men have often distrusted it. Actually the new insight may be a premise, in support of which rational thought must build a new structure. Moreover, intuitive insight may include a larger whole than sense data can immediately verify, just as complete knowledge of H₂O must include awareness of ice and steam even though water be its present form recognized by the senses. Water when it boils does not cease to be H₂O. So rational thought does not cease to be thought when it boils over into mystical, or integral, thought. Schweitzer recognizes that mystical thought may lead to a denial of knowledge based upon reason, and seek an experience apart from life itself. But this is a growth to be pruned. He says that mysticism is not the flower on the plant of thought.

It is but the stalk; ethics is the flower. What he calls ethical mysticism, therefore, "admits how absolutely mysterious and unfathomable are the world and life. It is knowledge insofar as it does know the one thing which we can and must know in the sphere of this mystery, namely, that all being is life, and that in loving self-devotion to other life we realize our spiritual union with Infinite Being."

Ordinary commonsense knowledge tells us that we must watch after ourselves and our interests first. But that knowledge is superseded when, through the experience of love, we see that another's life is as important as our own. Schweitzer, like Gandhi, would have us go one step further and see all others as objects of love. This step reason cannot take for us; nor can emotional attachment to another person. The step is made for us when we determine to look beyond the temporal to the eternal, to seek communion with the ground of all being.

But, insists le grand docteur, we cannot break through the ultimate mystery. Beyond us is the unfathomable deep. While we may measure time, we cannot measure eternity, and our time is bounded on all sides by the eternal. It is an awesome prospect to view and as we watch it we see all living creatures mirrored there. All creatures as one.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at second annual international student exchange dinner, Houston, Tex., Thursday, January 13, 1955.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him in reference to centennial of land-grant colleges.

By Mr. STENNIS (on behalf of Mr. Eavin):

Defense Mobilization Order IV-3, establishing an Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry, and a press release in connection therewith.

By Mr. DANIEL:

Statement prepared by him on 22d anniversary of the Lone Ranger.

CONTINUATION OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if Senators will indulge me, after conferring with the minority leader, I understand that several Senators are planning to be absent from the Chamber later in the day to attend a funeral. Several Senators also plan to be absent from the Chamber next week.

Therefore, in order that there may be a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Resolution 18, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution, with the understanding that the yeas and nays will be ordered on the resolution, and that immediately after the resolution is disposed of, the Senate will return to the consideration of morning business, so that Senators may continue to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader spoke to me about the proposed procedure. I know of no opposition on this side of the aisle to Senate Resolution 18. It was indicated to me, however, that a yea-and-nay vote was desired. I understand that several Senators on both sides of the aisle are planning to attend a funeral this afternoon, and also that several Senators on both sides of the aisle wish to attend the inauguration of their Governors next week. Therefore, it is desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution at this time. If that course is followed, all Members of the Senate will be able to meet their commitments. Following the vote on the resolution, it is my understanding that the Senate will resume the transaction of routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Communist Party of the United States is recognized to be a part of the international Communist conspiracy against the United States and all democratic forms of government. It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith, including the completion of all pending and unfinished investigations of such nature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas desire to have an immediate vote on the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is no objection, the yeas and nays having been ordered, I would suggest that the Senate is ready to vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness in his family.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and that, if present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Beall	Bridges
Allott	Bender	Bush
Anderson	Bennett	Butler
Barkley	Bible	Byrd
Barrett	Bricker	Capehart

Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Case, N. J.	Humphrey	Murray
Clements	Ives	Neely
Cotton	Jackson	Neuberger
Curtis	Jenner	Payne
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Duff	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kuchel	Scott
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Long	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fulbright	Malone	Stennis
George	Mansfield	Symington
Goldwater	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Hayden	McCarthy	Watkins
Hennings	McClellan	Welker
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Wiley
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Holland	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—12

Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pastore
Ervin	Lehman	Russell
Green	Monroney	Smathers

So the resolution (S. Res. 18) was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the understanding previously had, the Senate will resume morning business, strictly under the 2-minute rule.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT THE URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session I may report, from the Committee on Appropriations, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2091, which has passed the House of Representatives, so that it may be considered by the Senate next Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with the request just made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona for permission to report the urgent deficiency appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate, it is the plan, following a conference between the distinguished minority leader and myself, to call up the urgent deficiency bill in the Senate next Tuesday. I simply desired Senators to have advance notice of this intention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MILITARY SECURITY THROUGH ADEQUATE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the best presentation I have read in some time as to why adequate airpower, Army, Navy, and the Air Force, is not a matter that can be handled as normal American production problems in hard-line items are handled is contained in a thoughtful article by an able and experienced newspaperman in this field, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD directly following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1955]

FOURTEEN BILLION FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR AIR FORCE BUDGET NOT FOR EXPANSION BUT FOR BUYING REVOLUTIONARY NEW TYPE PLANES—REPLACEMENTS FOR PRESENT CRAFT MUST BE CAPABLE OF SPEEDS OF THOUSANDS OF MILES PER HOUR AND VERTICAL TAKEOFFS—RAPID OBSOLESCENCE POSES DILEMMA

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired), military analyst of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The Air Force budget for fiscal year 1956, which is to be about \$14,500,000,000 out of a total defense budget of about \$34,500,000,000, will not provide funds for any expansion. The money to purchase aircraft to build from the current strength of 121 wings to the planned goal of 137 wings has already been provided in previous appropriations.

The aircraft to be purchased from the 1956 appropriation will be for replacement of existing aircraft.

It is essential that the replacement aircraft should represent long steps forward in performance. This means that the barely supersonic F-100, which is replacing the Sabrejet F-86, should be replaced by a fighter capable of speeds of a thousand miles an hour, or more, powered possibly by ram-jet or rocket engines.

It means that the replacement bombers being designed to take over from the B-52, which is not yet in formations, and the B-47, the real work horse of American airpower, should be supersonic.

It may mean that all new aircraft for which requirements are being placed with manufacturers and designers should be capable of vertical takeoff.

REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

These steps ahead are as great a change as the shift from piston to jet engines, from speeds of 300 miles an hour to 700 miles an hour.

The business and budget emphasis in the administration and the Pentagon may very well delay the development of the new aircraft so long that when they are delivered in 1962 it will be like buying a new 1955 automobile at that time. The new aircraft are likely to be obsolete before they get into production.

There is a very serious dilemma in the production of new military aircraft between the need to get them into production as early as possible, and before they are obsolescent, and the cost of change and modification if production is undertaken without adequate testing.

The history of the B-47 six-jet bomber is an example. The requirements for this advanced medium bomber were established in 1946. Production did not start until more than 5 years later.

After the first B-47's were manufactured it was found that the tail gun was ineffective and would have to be completely redesigned. No crew members who tried to parachute from a disabled early model escaped with their lives. It was necessary to provide ejection seats which could be shot out of the plane, another big conversion job.

The bombsight was not in pressurized space. It was found that it required a great deal of maintenance and it was necessary to provide pressurization and access to it.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE PLANES MODIFIED

As a result, the first 88 B-47's had to be extensively modified at a cost of well over \$1 million each. The next 145 had almost equally extensive changes. Altogether it was not until B-47 No. 732 came off the pro-

duction line that the changes found by experience to be necessary had been incorporated.

The cost of modifying the first 731 B-47 bombers amounted to more than \$300 million.

This tale has been kept hidden in the Pentagon and there is no reason why it should be. It is just what is bound to happen when an almost wholly new instrument of incredible complexity is produced under urgent conditions.

It would have been possible to save half or two-thirds of the modification cost if the first few aircraft had been produced by hand and 2 or 3 years had been spent in development, modification, and getting out the bugs.

But had that been done the United States would not now have more than 1,000 B-47's ready to go when needed. Production was not stopped even though it was known that the aircraft coming off the assembly line would almost immediately have to go to a center for modification at great expense.

The business approach in the Pentagon considers this wasteful and extravagant. Air Force officials agree that it is costly, but ask: How else can you get a new aircraft into production before it is obsolete?

They point to the B-47 and ask if it is not worth the cost to have this finest jet bomber in the world in large numbers, almost certainly able to penetrate the defenses of the Soviet Union with negligible losses, instead of just getting it into production.

COMPROMISE WORKED OUT

A sort of compromise has been worked out between the need for speed in development of new aircraft and the cost of modification. Under this scheme only 12 or 13 airplanes would be produced in the first 18 months of production, for test and modification. This could be stretched out.

But even under this scheme, if quantity production is to be started in 18 months, the jigs and dies, orders for components and parts must be placed after 7 months. The result is that modifications found to be necessary by testing after the first 7 months cannot be put into the assembly line immediately, but will have to be made in a modification center.

Even under this scheme, the Air Force feels that to get the maximum potential out of any new airplane it will be necessary to cycle them all back through a modification center for modernizing after a certain amount of use.

NOT BUSINESSLIKE

All this breaks the heart of the defense comptroller, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury. It does not seem businesslike to them and, of course, it is not. It is just another of the awful wastes of the armaments race.

The eight-jet B-52 intercontinental bombers is a case in point right now. A few prototypes have been built. If we were to wait for another year or 2 years of testing, it would be impossible to meet the Air Force equipping schedule to replace the obsolescent B-36.

At the present time the business approach is predominant in the Pentagon. However, there are knowledgeable people in the Congress who are going to explore just such problems as these.

INVESTIGATION BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTACK ON COSTA RICA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Republic of Costa Rica filed a formal complaint with the Organization of American States that several of its cities had been attacked by airplanes from a foreign source, and that a force

had landed inside Costa Rica and was attempting to overthrow the Government of that country.

I am very happy that our State Department apparently took immediate action in the matter and was at least partly successful in getting the Organization of American States to send a mission with airplanes to Costa Rica, which were reinforced, I believe, with planes of our own.

The mission, as I understand, has made a tentative finding, as of this morning, that the planes which attacked the Costa Rican cities came from a foreign source; and a former President of Costa Rica, according to press dispatches just received, has stated that his son is in command of the forces inside Costa Rica.

While the State Department, at times, is severely criticized, and while I reserve the right in the future to criticize it when I think it is wrong, I believe that in this matter it has acted with speed to isolate aggression and to throw the moral influence of the United States against the aggression. I hope that it will continue to proceed along this course, because if we permit the democratic government of Costa Rica to be overthrown by a revolutionary movement or by aggression from outside, it will have a most unfortunate effect throughout Latin America.

WINDFALL PROFITS FROM GOVERNMENT LOANS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, an article appeared in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Four Builders Have Agreed Tentatively To Return Over \$1 Million in Windfall Profits."

I think the present officials of the FHA should be commended for establishing a policy which might well mean the return of millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury.

Some question has been raised that perhaps the distribution of these unwarranted or so-called windfall profits was not actually a violation of any law, but no question has been raised that they were morally wrong.

As an enforcement measure, the Government can and should refuse to recognize any of these individuals or groups having received such windfall profits from future consideration of Government loans or Government-guaranteed mortgages in future building operations until such time as that builder or builders has restored to the Government all of their ill-begotten gains.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article published in today's Wall Street Journal, together with my letter of December 8, 1954, to Mr. Norman Mason and his reply thereto under date of December 15.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1955]

Four builders have agreed tentatively to return over \$1 million in windfall profits.

So disclosed Frank Meistrall, General Counsel of the Federal Housing Administra-

tion, in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee. Names of the builders were not revealed.

Meistrell said there are very good grounds for recovering a further substantial amount of the hundreds of millions of dollars involved. He also reported evidence of possible fraud and corruption in the program.

Builders and promoters got windfall profits when they obtained Government-insured loans greater than their actual costs and pocketed the difference.

DECEMBER 8, 1954.

Mr. NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MASON: I was very much concerned to read in last night's paper the announcement that you had cleared about 25 builders who had made windfall profits as eligible for new FHA-insured loans on the basis that their windfalls had not been too substantial. I do note, however, in this morning's paper that upon the request of the Department of Justice you have canceled this order.

It is my opinion that any blanket forgiveness of such practices that were condoned under the previous administration cannot be justified. I would suggest a better policy would be to publicly announce that any builder who had received such windfall profits in prior years, even though no criminal prosecution is involved, would still be required to pay back either direct to the Government or to the corporation against which the Government holds liens, all funds siphoned out of the company as windfall profits, and that the further requirements be made that no distribution of windfall profits be made until after the mortgage to the Federal Government has been fully paid. To adopt any other policy would have the appearance of condoning that which we have all condemned up to this time.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., December 15, 1954.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of December 8, 1954, regarding the efforts being made to recover windfall profits and to find some satisfactory basis upon which certain building firms and individuals on the so-called windfall list may be permitted to again have access to the benefits of FHA insurance.

It is gratifying to me that your views in this matter seem so nearly identical with my own views. Our procedure is to carefully review each case and to discuss with the particular firm or individual the actions which must be taken for the protection of the Government's interest. This may include the payment back to the corporation of any windfall profits which have been distributed. Our objective is, of course, to effect savings in rent for the occupants of these rental projects if possible, while at the same time effecting the maximum possible recovery through reduction of the Government's risk.

As you know, there are a very large number of firms and individuals involved, and a few of them have indicated their desire to approach the entire matter with a cooperative attitude. It is only in such instances where infractions are remedied that resumption of business relations will be permitted.

I certainly agree with you that any offenders who refuse to work with the FHA in its efforts to reduce the Government's risk should be refused the benefits of participa-

tion in the FHA program, and I am pleased that you wrote to me as you did.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

END OF BULK-MAIL EXPERIMENT

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I congratulate Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for ordering an end to the bulk-mail experiment for unaddressed letters and advertisements.

For many months several of us in the Congress have objected to the unaddressed-mail system which General Summerfield inaugurated on August 21, 1953. We urged that it was a costly and burdensome system—unfair to the post-office patrons whose boxes were stuffed with the mail, and unfair to the post-office employees who bore the brunt of the additional work.

General Summerfield is to be congratulated on recognizing the mistake and the unsatisfactory result of this order. It is commendable that he has discontinued the practice, and I only wish that his order could be amended to become effective at a date earlier than March 31, 1955, the date now planned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, entitled "Mail Nuisance Ended," and the Post Office Department release of December 30, 1954, announcing this change, be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

MAIL NUISANCE ENDED

The Post Office Department's 15-month-old junk-mail delivery experiment should have been called off long ago.

But at last, under pressure of irate Congressmen needled by overburdened constituents, Postmaster General Summerfield has decreed it is to end next March 31. Presumably the unhappily distant deadline was set in order to give users of the unaddressed mailing system ample opportunity to compile specific address lists.

This scatter-shot plan for the cost-benefit of a relatively few large direct-mail advertisers was an unfair burden on the mail carriers, on householders, and on the Post Office Department's financial plight.

There is reasonable question, too, whether the advertisers' loss in public goodwill did not cancel out the saving in expense of individual addressing.

Also, as a matter of ethics does a junk mailer have a moral right to use a distribution system designed to serve individuals, to invade a house whose tenant he has not gone to the trouble even to identify? Especially when the recipient cannot stop it except by ordering all mail stopped?

The junk-mail nuisance is well rid of; sooner than March 31 if possible.

[Post Office Department Release]

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield today announced that city and village delivery of simplified address mail, established on an experimental basis 15 months ago, will be discontinued effective midnight March 31, 1955.

The extension of simplified address mail to city and village delivery was started by the Post Office Department on August 21, 1953, in an effort to reduce the huge losses incurred in handling third-class mail and to

provide an additional service to the public. The results have not satisfactorily met these objectives and the only possible solution is increased postage rates, which will be sought in the next session of the Congress.

City and village delivery of simplified address mail which is to be discontinued on next March 31 gave mailers the privilege of omitting names and street addresses from circulars and other mail matter and using the designations "Householder," "Patron," or "Box Holder" as addresses.

This elimination of simplified address mail from city and village delivery service does not affect the delivery of simplified address mail on rural routes or to boxholders at post offices where no city or village delivery service is available. This service has been in effect since October 1934.

Neither does the decision announced today by the Postmaster General affect the delivery on city or village routes of "Occupant" mail bearing no name but using a proper street address, which was inaugurated on October 12, 1934.

The Postmaster General's order discontinuing city and village delivery of simplified address mail, appearing in the next issue of the Postal Bulletin on January 4, 1955, will read as follows:

"City and village delivery of simplified address mail, which was established on an experimental basis on August 21, 1953, is discontinued, effective midnight March 31, 1955.

"Section 123.4 of the Postal Manual is amended to read as follows as of that date:

"41. Style of address: Third-class mail intended for delivery to all patrons on a route or to all boxholders at a post office, not having city or village letter carrier service, may be addressed in one of the following styles on each piece: a. Rural or Star Route Boxholder, b. Post Office Boxholder."

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, each day evidence accumulates to support construction of a high multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon, on the Oregon-Idaho border.

For the past year the administration has been trying to distract attention from Hells Canyon by promoting projects which rely upon Canadian water sources or the use of Canadian soil.

Totally ignored by the administration has been the fact that Canada is one of the world's fastest-growing nations, needing all its own resources for legitimate expansion and development.

The Canadian resources department has now indicated that it might tap the flow of the upper Columbia in order to add to the power potentialities of the Fraser River, which is entirely within British Columbia. Such a step actually would diminish the power resources this administration often cites as a possible alternative to Hells Canyon. Let me point out, however, that it could have no effect on the Snake River system, where is located Hells Canyon, and which is free of reliance on Canadian headwaters.

Furthermore, the national government of Canada at Ottawa has introduced legislation to prevent the use of Canadian water to generate power for factories in the United States, according to the New York Times of January 11, 1955.

Mr. President, I urge the Interior Department to abandon its ill-considered opposition to approval of a Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Such a dam has been recommended by the famous 308 Report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the

master plan for development of the Columbia Basin.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that western Canada will not encourage the diversion to the United States of its hydroelectric resources. Why, then, should the administration continue to promote Canadian projects as possible substitutes for Hells Canyon, which is within our own borders and available to us immediately, if only we authorize the project for Federal construction?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a thoughtful editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, of January 10, 1955, a news dispatch from the New York Times of January 11, 1955, and an Associated Press item from the Seattle Daily Times of December 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of January 10, 1955]

DESIGNS ON THE COLUMBIA

The Columbia River is a mighty valuable property, about half of which belongs to Canada and half to the United States. The Northwest States have been regarding with a fishy eye recurrent proposals that Columbia waters be diverted at the mouth or elsewhere, via a plastic tube or a big ditch, to thirsty California. But it comes as somewhat of a shock that the Dominion of Canada may also have designs on Columbia waters which normally would feed the powerplants and irrigated croplands of Oregon and Washington.

The far-ranging Christian Science Monitor reports that the Government at Ottawa has announced it will study the feasibility of diverting surplus water from the Columbia River to the Thompson River, which comes within 7 miles of the Columbia west of Revelstoke, British Columbia. The Thompson is a lusty tributary of the mighty Fraser. The linking of the Columbia and the Fraser, to divert floodwaters westward through British Columbia instead of storing them on the Columbia for hydroelectric use downstream in low-water periods, would be a project staggering in its effects.

While we have been guarding against a water raid from the south, our Canadian friends upstream have been thinking of cutting us down at the source.

The Monitor suggests that the Canadian Government may not be willing to approve any of the Columbia River projects now being proposed in Canada until the engineers have given them the data on Columbia diversion to the Fraser. These include the United States Federal project at Libby, on the Kootenai, a tributary of the Columbia, which would back water into Canada and requires approval of the International Joint Commission; Henry Kaiser's proposal to dam lower Arrow Lake, to increase production of United States dams downstream; and the gigantic Mica Creek project above Arrow Lakes which would provide both at-site power and downstream benefits.

There is a United States-Canada treaty of 1909 on regulation of the Columbia River. But it seems to be the presumption of the Ottawa Government that it would not hinder the diversion of excess or flood waters to the Fraser. Such diversion would, of course, result in less complete use of the Columbia than long-range planners in this country have envisaged. A project of this nature might also put a severe strain on the amicable relations which have existed between the two countries, and which have been encouraged by the British Columbia govern-

ment which, unlike Ottawa, is not opposed to export of power.

British Columbia officials have been urging project clearance, financial aid from the United States, and early starts on upper Columbia projects in the Province. They are not worried about exporting power or water. Not so the Canadian Government. In an address before the Pacific Northwest Trade Association at Spokane in November 1953, Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, concluded some remarks on Canadian-United States disagreements over Libby and other dams with this comment: "Please do not think * * * there is going to be power in Canada which will be surplus and to spare. This is certainly not the case, for the most carefully made predictions show that only a comparatively short time remains until we may expect that all our economically available hydro power will be in use."

The Canadian study of feasibility of diverting Columbia waters to strengthen the Fraser as a power producer should not, of course, send the United States into a frantic hunt for means to retaliate by diverting the Pend Oreille and Kootenai Rivers, which cross into Canada, mostly to our benefit. Nor should it bring relaxation of Federal efforts to get agreement on Libby or other projects. It should, however, put additional emphasis on the need for a quick formula for construction of John Day Dam as the immediate next step in Columbia hydropower use. Dams in Canada for United States benefit, including Libby, may not be realized soon, if ever.

[From the New York Times of January 11, 1955]

CANADA OPPOSES DAM—BILL WOULD BAR USE OF HER WATER FOR POWER IN UNITED STATES PLANTS

OTTAWA, January 10.—The Canadian Government introduced legislation today to prevent the use of Canadian water to generate power for factories in the United States. The bill specifies that a Federal lease is necessary for any construction affecting the natural flow of an international river.

What provoked the Government's action was a proposal before the Provincial Government of British Columbia to dam the Arrow Lakes section of the Columbia River. The dam was to be constructed in Canada to provide power for an aluminum smelter in the United States.

Similar proposals have been made for damming the waters of rivers in the northwest territories for smelters in Alaska.

The Federal Government is becoming more and more conscious of its natural resources and is determined to protect them.

[From the Seattle Times of December 20, 1954]

DIVERSION FROM COLUMBIA MAY BOOST FRASER

OTTAWA, December 20.—The Canadian Resources Department will conduct an investigation next summer into the economic feasibility of diverting flood water for hydroelectric power from the Columbia River into the Fraser River system in British Columbia.

Resources Minister Jean Lesage, announcing the investigation today, said it will complement studies being made by the International Joint Commission on the Power Potentialities of the Columbia River Basin of Canada and the United States.

EXTRA POWER POSSIBLE

It has been estimated, Lesage said, that several billion kilowatt hours of additional power could be produced annually by a diversion from the Columbia to the Fraser.

The diversion would be made at the Columbia's "big bend," where the northwest-flowing river turns south toward the United States border. Seven miles from the bend is Summit Lake, the origin of the Eagle and

South Thompson Rivers. Water diverted to the lake would flow down them and into the Fraser.

STORAGE FACILITIES LACKING

"Owing to the lack of complete storage and control facilities," the minister said, "a large amount of the flood water of the Columbia cannot now be used for power or other purposes."

"If a dam were constructed below the big bend of the Columbia, with control facilities in the vicinity of Revelstoke, it might be possible to use the waters thus stored for the production of power on the adjoining Fraser River."

DOCTORING OF TRANSCRIPT OF NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Daily News there appears as a lead story an interesting article written by an enterprising, industrious, and reliable reporter, Morris Cunningham, under the headline "Admiral Strauss Doctored Transcript." News of such alteration of the official record appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on January 8, 1955. Thereafter there appeared an editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal entitled "Chicanery in High Places."

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Washington Daily News of today, and the editorial appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of January 10, 1955, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 14, 1955]

ADMIRAL STRAUSS DOCTORED TRANSCRIPT (By Morris Cunningham)

By doctoring the transcript of a recent news conference the Atomic Energy Commission under Chairman Lewis L. Strauss has gone into the business of rewriting history.

The conference was held by Admiral Strauss December 17 in which he said the Army Corps of Engineers had approved the site of the Dixon-Yates plant.

The statement was not true and the Engineers Corps protested.

It's surprising that a man in such close communion with the Dixon-Yates deal as Admiral Strauss would offer the assertion to a roomful of newsmen as a statement of fact.

But the surprises did not end there.

The morning after Admiral Strauss' news conference, Maj. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson, Acting Chief of the Engineers Corps phoned this writer a categorical denial that Army engineers had approved the site.

Had Admiral Strauss been quoted accurately?

CHECKED TRANSCRIPT

Morse Salisbury, AEC Information Chief, allowed this writer and another reporter to inspect a carbon copy of a transcript of the admiral's news conference.

The transcript revealed this statement by Admiral Strauss:

"There has been some discussion of whether it was wise to have put the plant there in the first place. The Corps of Engineers and engineers retained by the sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one."

"This elevation here [pointing to a chart] shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood. I understand that records have been made since 1880, or thereabouts, some 74 years of record, and the plant has

been located at what the Corps of Engineers feel is a safe place."

Last week—almost a month later—the AEC quietly distributed printed copies of what purports to be an accurate stenographic transcript of the conference.

On page 10 there is this version of what Admiral Strauss is purported to have said about the approval of the site:

"There has been some discussion of whether it was wise to have put the plant there in the first place. Engineers retained by the sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one.

"This elevation here shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood, I understand that records have been made since 1880 or thereabouts, some 74 years of record, and the plant has been located at what our AEC engineers, after discussions with the Memphis District Office Corps of Engineers, and review of the date, feel is the best place."

The revised version eliminates Admiral Strauss' statement that the site was approved by the Corps of Engineers.

NO FOOTNOTES

The changes were made in the printed version without any footnotes or other indications of revision.

The fact is that the Army Corps of Engineers not only has not approved the site, but in fact did not even receive an application for construction of the plant until last week.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of January 10, 1955]

CHICANERY IN HIGH PLACES

On December 11 newspapermen heard Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, say Army engineers have approved location of proposed Dixon-Yates powerplant.

K. D. Nichols was present and kept silent as Mr. Strauss spoke. Mr. Nichols, now AEC manager, has been an Army engineer general. He must have known how extraordinary it would have been if the Army engineers had advised Dixon-Yates to build anything anywhere.

As a matter of plain fact, the Army engineers had neither approved nor been asked to approve the site. The first connection of the Corps of Engineers with Dixon-Yates came nearly a month after the Strauss incident, when approval was asked for a part of the plans involving only the coal unloading and cooling water structures in the river.

Highest officials of the Engineer Corps protested strongly when they learned what Mr. Strauss had said.

A stenographic transcript made by the AEC showed that Mr. Strauss had said the Corps of Engineers took part in selecting the site as the best of 16 examined. He went further, according to the stenographic record, to say that after looking at flood records the Corps of Engineers considered the site to be safe.

But the AEC has now published its record of what was said and the Corps of Engineers has strangely disappeared from the remarks about examining 16 sites and choosing the West Memphis location.

The record has been doctored.
Who did the doctoring?

PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Malone Report Proves United States Is a 'Have' Nation," published in

the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of Monday, January 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa Daily Times of January 10, 1955]

MALONE REPORT PROVES UNITED STATES IS A "HAVE" NATION

A little publicized report by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE's Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels reveals that the Western Hemisphere can be turned into a powerful fortress, containing all the necessary raw materials to feed a war machine.

This important finding destroys a long-held concept that the United States is a "have-not" Nation. Here is what Senator MALONE has to say about the significance of his subcommittee's study:

"For nearly a score of years our domestic and foreign policy has been based on the assumption that we are a 'have-not' Nation, dependent on the Old World for almost all our critical minerals and materials. This report completely shatters that theory. It proves conclusively that there is no remote possibility that this Nation, together with the Western Hemisphere, will or can exhaust its resources of critical materials at any time in the foreseeable future."

Thus, the United States and its friends in the Western Hemisphere are independent and can exist without counting on the Old World for a single critical item.

This finding supports an argument frequently offered in the Times editorial columns for greater emphasis on our ties with Latin America and less concern with the wavering, unpredictable, and often stagnant European countries.

The Malone subcommittee has accomplished a tremendous and tedious task in digesting 10 volumes of published testimony and summing it up in less than 390 pages. It is to be congratulated for developing the facts which prove the New World is in itself self-sufficient and destroying the old myth that overseas ties must be maintained at all costs.

Some of the subcommittee recommendations suggest:

1. Close cooperation between all nations of the Western Hemisphere, the only dependable source of necessary critical war materials.
2. Elimination of the Nation's present dependency upon remote and possibly unfriendly or neutral areas of the world for critical materials.
3. Stimulation of production by increased depletion allowances.

The subcommittee report goes on to outline a positive program of action to insure a wealth of critical materials in the event the Western Hemisphere must become a fortress.

One of the key findings of the report is stated simply and directly:

"Since the testimony of competent witnesses indicates that the Western Hemisphere will be the only dependable source of critical war materials in the event of an all-out war, it is imperative to the security of this Nation and to the nations of the Western Hemisphere that we and they foster the greatest measure of self-sufficiency in the production of such materials and continually study all possible devices that will encourage the hemispheric production in this vital field."

This means a closer working agreement with the Latin American countries and greater development of our own resources and less dependence upon those of overseas producers.

It is vitally important that the findings and recommendations of the Malone subcommittee be recognized early and applied as speedily as possible.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Senate Report No. 1627 published on July 9, 1954, was the result of Senate Resolution 143, first session of the 83d Congress directing the committee to determine the accessibility of critical materials in time of war, for our expanding economy and for our security.

The committee determined that the Western Hemisphere can be defended and that it can be made self-sufficient in the production of the necessary critical materials to fight a war or live in peace.

HENRY W. TEMPLE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have the sad duty of announcing to the Senate the passing of Henry W. Temple, a distinguished Pennsylvanian who served for 20 years as a Representative in Congress.

Dr. Temple was, for many years, my good friend and neighbor in my home town of Washington, Pa. He died Tuesday morning, January 11, in his 91st year.

In his long and honorable career Dr. Temple gained distinction in varied activities.

As a clergyman he was a spiritual leader of strength and power. As an educator he gave many generations of students a clear insight into the science of government, and inspired them with patriotic devotion to the principles of Americanism. As a public servant he gave the Nation the benefit of his wise statesmanship and his scholarly attainments as a foremost authority on international affairs.

He served in the National Guard of Pennsylvania as chaplain of the old 10th Pennsylvania Infantry, my old regiment, in which I began my own military career.

Dr. Temple was a kindly man, always ready with wise counsel and advice for those who sought his guidance. He was held in the highest esteem by his fellow citizens, who looked upon him with love and affection as the grand old man of Washington, Pa.

Dr. Temple was born in Ohio, and came into Pennsylvania as a young man to attend Geneva College at Beaver Falls. Upon his graduation he studied for the ministry at the Covenant Theological Seminary. For a number of years he served as pastor of churches at Baxter, Leechburg, and Washington.

He had long been interested in the study of history and government, and in 1898 he joined the faculty of Washington and Jefferson College as professor of political science.

In 1912 he was prevailed upon to be a candidate for Congress on the Progressive-Republican, or Bull Moose, ticket and was elected to the 63d Congress. He was unsuccessful as a candidate to succeed himself, but was elected to the 64th Congress to fill a vacancy. He was re-elected as a Republican to the 65th Congress, and to seven succeeding Congresses.

During his service in Congress Dr. Temple rose to the chairmanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where his comprehensive knowledge of foreign

affairs and his untiring devotion to duty made him one of the strong leaders of Congress.

Upon his retirement to private life in 1933, he rejoined the faculty of Washington and Jefferson College, continuing his association with world affairs as Professor of International Relations.

Pennsylvania honors Dr. Temple as one who devoted a lifetime to the service of his fellowman. He exemplified in full measure the highest qualities of Christian character and statesmanship.

Pennsylvania mourns his passing as a great loss to the State and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Washington Reporter of January 11, 1955, and an editorial published in the Washington Observer of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of January 11, 1955]

DR. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Dr. Henry W. Temple, minister of the Gospel, educator, statesman, first citizen of Washington, and a friendly man, is dead.

When death closed his eyes early this morning in his home in Locust Avenue it brought to an end a career that spanned many decades of challenging and exhilarating progress in the life of this Nation and the world, a program in which Dr. Temple played no mean part.

Born while the North and the South were locked in bitter combat, Dr. Temple watched with observant eyes and a receptive mind the rapid growth of the Nation—which was yet trying to find its place in the sun—and his part in helping shape that growth, congenial the thinking of the people by sincerely and authoritatively giving of the best of his knowledge to young men, in and out of college, as they mapped the start of their own careers, is beyond price.

Dr. Temple was a man of sincere and deep Christian beliefs and he approached and overcame all problems with which he and the Nation were faced in that attitude. He was a whole man in all respects, a friendly man, a man who believed in and practiced the Christian concept of the dignity and worth of the individual, and he did not allow his perspective to become clouded. In short, associating and knowing the great of the Nation and of Europe he was the same man who climbed the steps to the pulpit, stood before his college classes, or gave wise counsel to the many who sought his advice.

As a minister and an educator he left an impression on this community and on Washington and Jefferson College in particular which will live long after him. Because of him and his influence Washington is a better place in which to live and those who sat in his congregation and those who studied under him, scattered as they are today, carry with them some portion of the innate goodness and kindness of the man.

Dr. Temple loved the simple things of life and he was thrilled by the magnificence of nature. He was a man who enjoyed good talk and one of his passions was the exchange of ideas with his fellow men, particularly on current events and as they affected life and the living of it throughout the world.

An acknowledged authority on international affairs, he saw the people of other nations as potentially neighbors and friends, struggling to attain the finer things of life, and it was in that attitude that he ap-

proached the many problems which were his and his colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

In Dr. Temple was combined to an amazing extent those qualities which we look for and expect in our leaders and with it all he was a man of the people, interested in and closely attuned to his home, his family and friends who never talked with him but that they left with a lift to their spirits and renewed courage for the tasks with which they were faced.

Humble and forthright in his dealings with his fellow men the stamp of greatness was about him and could be and was felt by all who were privileged to know him and rejoice in that association.

A man who kept his feet always on a solid foundation composed of the eternal truths, he was progressive in his thinking, realized that life does move on, that each generation builds on the past. He approved of progress and lent it his assistance, but above all, he urged retention of the simple things which guided men in the right direction.

One of the activities in which he played a leading role and in which he exhibited a humble pride was acquisition of vast stretches of scenic land which today are known as the Shenandoah and Great Smokies Parks. He was but true to himself when he led this campaign because he was doing something for his fellow man and in that he exhibited his inherent greatness.

Another loved face has left us, but his memory and the effect of his good works will be ours to enrich our lives.

A man died this morning.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

LEADING CITIZEN OF COMMUNITY DIES

Washington's leading citizen is dead.

For more than 60 years Dr. Henry W. Temple stood foremost among the religious, political, educational, and civic leaders of the entire country.

He came to Washington as minister of one of the town's largest churches.

That job was not big enough for a man of his caliber, and in a few years he moved up—to a college classroom, where his character and pronounced ability as an educator made a profound influence on a generation of students at Washington and Jefferson.

Then he moved up again. This time he was called by the God he had served as minister and educator to become one of the Nation's foremost legislators. He was elected to a seat in the National House of Representatives, and he it said to the credit of his humility, no one was more surprised at his election than was he.

In Congress he soon became known as the Nation's foremost authority on foreign and international affairs. The history he had been teaching to his students had educated him, and had given him a knowledge of what was going on in the world that was unmatched. And for a score of years he was one of the most respected men in Congress, both because of his outstanding character and integrity and because of his knowledge and leadership in legislative matters.

Not since the death of Dr. Temple's close friend, Dr. James David Moffatt, who also served the college and the community for many years, has Washington had another man whose entire life has exerted such an influence for good and for intellect and spiritual advance.

Dr. Temple will be missed. Even in the evening years of his life, when he was more or less invalid, he exerted an influence on the life of this city which was good. That influence has been exerted through churches, college classes, and through individual contacts.

CENTENNIAL OF YWCA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in New York, on Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at the YWCA centennial inaugural luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, our Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, made a memorable address. Because of the importance of the address, and because of world tensions, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE WE SEEK

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, at the YWCA centennial inaugural luncheon, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel; New York, N. Y., Tuesday, January 11, 1955)

I should like to talk with you about peace. "Peace" is one of the most beautiful and honored words of our language. However, the word has been so tarnished and besmirched by Soviet Communist propaganda that today, in their mouths, it is scarcely recognizable.

It is time that we rescue this great word from that undeserved fate and proclaim true peace throughout the lands.

Peace is a word which is rich in its meaning. It implies an absence of violence and warfare. But there is much more to it than that. It also implies the inner tranquility which comes to those who are enabled to pursue happiness and develop their God-given possibilities of body, mind, and soul.

To the orthodox Communists, on the other hand, peace is a negative, barren concept. It means a state of enforced conformity where all men think alike, believe alike, and act in accordance with a pattern imposed by their rulers, who constitute what they call a dictatorship of the proletariat.

If that system of conformity can be made worldwide, then, they argue, there will be an end to war. Thus, in the name of peace they seek to extend their power throughout the world.

One thing is clear about this kind of peace: the international Communists cannot establish it without first resorting to war. This they admit. Of course, they use propaganda, subversion, and menaces to soften up others in the hope that they will give in without resistance. That is their peace offensive. But they foresee that many will never peacefully accept their rule. So Lenin taught, and Stalin agreed, that a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.

The fanatical Communists believe that the end result—a world of total conformity—justifies these frightful means. And rulers who are moved by a primitive lust for power find it convenient to cloak their ambitions in such a doctrinal garb.

When we hear talk of peace from the Communist camp, we must always look behind this talk to the nature of the Communist system. It is not a peace system but a force system, for only force can suppress the aspirations of men's souls. Individuals yearn to do what will satisfy them, not their masters. They want themselves to implement the protective love which binds together the family unit. They want to commune with that higher Power whom throughout the ages men have revered as God, and to feel that they do His bidding. Only under coercion do they accept a system which repudiates love of family, love of country, love of God, and which treats men as bits of matter. That is not peace. Yet this is the false concept of peace with

which the Communists load their heaviest propaganda guns.

The God-fearing peoples want peace. But they seek it by using, not suppressing, men's finest qualities. They know that society needs rules of conduct which promote harmony. But they find that the source of those rules is primarily moral or natural law, which is not manmade, and that the sanction for those rules is primarily a voluntary subjection to moral law, and not the arbitrary imposition of a police state.

It is, of course, immensely difficult to preserve both peace and freedom. Nevertheless, we need not feel hopeless. Every year bears its harvest of events which show that the goal we seek is not beyond human capacity to attain.

During the past year there have been many acts of peace. One was the settlement between Great Britain and Egypt of the Suez Base controversy. Two years ago I was in that area. Warfare was close to breaking out. Indeed, both sides were planning for that contingency. Nevertheless, counsels of moderation prevailed. The method of patient negotiation was followed, and finally a solution was found. It involved concessions by both of the parties. But today there is peace in the true sense, and we can hope that that example will extend its benign influence throughout that distraught near-eastern area.

A similar peace was made between Italy and Yugoslavia with relation to Trieste. Here again deep national feelings seemed to conflict to a degree which permitted of no peaceful solution. A point was reached where both sides were moving troops toward the danger zone. But again the processes of negotiation and diplomacy were invoked. Each side exercised moderation and made concessions, with the result that a true peace has been achieved. We are entitled to hope that this peace, too, will spread its influence, so that the south European area will gain unity and strength to replace divisive weakness.

The Manila Conference of last September drew together colonial and anticolonial nations. Yet out of that conference emerged the Pacific Charter, in which the nations of the West joined with the nations of the East to proclaim in ringing terms the basic right of all peoples to self-government and independence.

Also, during the past year a new start was made in Western Europe toward ending the national differences which for generations have led to recurrent wars. These wars have steadily grown in scope and intensity. They have so depleted Europe's human, material, and moral strength that for the first time western civilization can be seriously challenged by an atheistic system.

It is indeed a shocking thing that Western Europe, which has long been the cradle of Christian civilization, should also for so long have been the principal cockpit of war.

To end that situation, the European Defense Community was conceived. It would have integrated permanently those forces which, in separation, have been hostile. When that failed of adoption, this same purpose was transferred to the present plan for Western European union.

There are some who treat this project as merely a device to rearm the Germans. That is belittling almost to the point of absurdity. Of course, Germans, like all self-respecting people, have the right and duty to contribute to international peace and security. That, however, is but a byproduct of the great conception of bringing the countries of Western Europe into a relationship so close and so permanent that it is inconceivable that they again should fight each other. The real issue is: Shall the peoples of Europe be content to go on living in a political structure which has been the world's worst

fire hazard or will they build something better?

The new arrangements naturally encounter resistance. That is always the case when great deeds are done. The project for Federal union in this country encountered opposition and in several States the margin of approval was meager and precarious. So it will be in Europe. But we can have good hope that this great act of peace will be consummated through the indispensable contribution, by French and Germans, of tolerance, self-restraint, and vision.

The United Nations during this past year played a notable part in serving, as its charter prescribes, as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations. We eagerly await the return from China of its Secretary General and his report on the outcome of a United Nations mission which critically involves issues of humanity and justice. Our own Nation makes its contribution to the peaceful settlement of these issues by heeding the Biblical injunction to be slow to anger.

I could go on to multiply the proofs of man's capacity to build true peace. Last year was enriched by them. A cataloging is, however, unnecessary. You know, as I know, that peace in the lofty sense of that word is in fact within man's reach. The limiting factor is not impossibility but the lack of well-directed effort and sacrifice which could turn the possible into the actual.

The hard fact is that while throughout the ages men have longed for peace, they have seldom worked for it in a serious, intelligent, and sustained way. It is indeed shocking to contrast what men do in time of war to win victory and what they do in time of peace to prevent new war.

When we are at war, the Nation unites and every mature citizen stands ready to respond to the call of duty. No sacrifice, even that of life itself, seems too great. Yet, when there is peace, men often think that it is sufficient to turn the task over to a few professionals and to hope, and perhaps to pray, that they will succeed. I do not minimize the value of those hopes and particularly of those prayers. They powerfully sustain those who carry heavy burdens. But in every country there is desperate need for greater willingness to make the national sacrifices which may be required for peace.

There will never be permanent peace so long as men and nations reserve for war their greatest effort, their most sacrificial endeavor.

In this country there is a vast urge for peace. We ended the fighting in Korea. We are helping, in partnership with others, to develop collective security throughout the free world. We shall, I hope, follow enlightened economic policies such as those President Eisenhower recommended yesterday. We extend good offices to promote acts of peace elsewhere, such as those I have mentioned and many others.

Perhaps never before has any nation done so much for peace. Our record is good, as judged by the past. But the past provides no proper standard. There is still too much complacency. Winning peace is a desperate struggle against an enemy—the war system—which so far has never been permanently defeated. Today that system is in fact sponsored by greater military power than has ever before existed.

This struggle for peace cannot be won by pacifism or by neutralism or by weakness. These methods have been tried and they have failed. Aggression is deterred only by an evident will and capacity to fight for rights more precious than is a debasing peace.

But also, peace cannot be won by truculence or by intolerance, without or within. Peace has to be planned as a campaign in which many factors are weighed. It is a

campaign in which it may be necessary to strive even when success may be improbable, and to accept occasional reverses. Indeed, to deter war and to save peace we may have to be ready to fight, if need be, and to have the resources and the allies to assure that an aggressor would surely be defeated.

In all of this the nations which truly want peace should be able to enlist the individual and collective support of their people.

To achieve true peace is, I know, a deep concern of the Young Women's Christian Association. You have grown in strength and vigor for now 100 years. But the tasks before you remain great and ever more imperative.

Therefore, I am grateful for this opportunity to bring to you this message—a message of hope, but also a message of deep urgency.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I recently made regarding the balancing of the budget.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I regard Secretary Humphrey as one of the ablest men who has ever guided the Treasury, but I am very much disappointed in his statement that there is no prospect of balancing the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

This means that we will then start the 23d deficit year in the past 26. It is time that the administration and the Congress face up to the reality of our fiscal situation. Since the deficit spending began we have increased the Federal debt from \$16 billion to approximately \$280 billion.

No prospect is now held out that the budget will be brought into balance this year or next. We are enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. We are not engaged in war. If we cannot balance the budget now, I ask when can we balance it? Are we on a chronic deficit basis?

During the period of this deficit spending we have accumulated astronomical debt. Our children and future generations must pay the interest, and some day they will have to pay the principal. Meanwhile, deficit spending has been the main factor in reducing the purchasing power of the American dollar from 100 cents in 1942 to 52 cents today.

The foremost plank in President Eisenhower's campaign was the promise of a balanced budget. A reduction of 7 percent in Government spending this year would place our financial affairs on a pay-as-you-go basis without increasing taxes. In the third year of his administration it is time that he fulfilled his campaign pledge.

We have given away \$40 billion to foreign nations, all of which has been added to the public debt. The first thing we should do is to eliminate economic aid to other countries, all of which have smaller debts than ours. Few will deny that there is opportunity for retrenchment by the elimination of waste and extravagance in every single activity of the Government.

If we continue to play Santa Claus to our people at home and half of the world abroad, we can expect nothing but collapse of our currency with all of its terrible consequences.

The private-enterprise system is based upon the principle that the people support the Government and not the Government the people.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO FILL VACANCIES ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to make some announcements.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Select Committee on Small Business.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Select Committee on Small Business.

By request of the Vice President and upon the recommendation and nomination of the majority leader, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is appointed to the vacancy existing on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

FIRST REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on Monday the President of the United States transmitted a report of activities under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Public Law 480, authorized by the last Congress, with full bipartisan support, provided for the sale of \$700 million worth of surplus farm products for foreign currencies, and for gifts of \$300 million worth of farm products over a 3-year period.

The sale of farm products for foreign currencies, as provided in the act, was a new and uncharted course. Therefore, we provided in the law that the President should report to the Congress at least once each 6 months, and at such other times as seemed appropriate. The report—House Document No. 62—transmitted to us on Monday was the first of these reports. It deserves close consideration.

The finding of constructive uses for the accumulation of farm surpluses was a challenge to the 83d Congress. The Congress met that challenge by the bipartisan enactment of Public Law 480. The President's report on activities under Public Law 480 for the first 6 months suggests to me that, with some rather minor changes, we can use for constructive purposes, and in a dignified and businesslike manner, through Public Law 480, a limited amount of surpluses.

I was a cosponsor of this important enactment, and I have followed very closely the operations under it. I wish to comment briefly on the President's report and the operations, to date, under Public Law 480, as I see them.

SALES OF FARM PRODUCTS

The President's report revealed that sales of \$453 million worth of farm products, including shipping costs, have already been negotiated or are in the process of being negotiated. Of this amount, it is estimated that 43 percent will be used for grains, principally wheat; and 28 percent for cotton. This would increase wheat exports by one-third over those of last year.

The allocation of the funds among commodities seems reasonable, except that I view with great disappointment, as I am sure you do, Mr. President, the fact that such a paltry amount is to be used for dairy products. United States prices on dairy products should be very attractive to foreign buyers when payment can be made in their own currencies. I think this body should determine the specific reasons why dairy products are not being sold under this program. It is regrettable that certain nonbasic farm products which are in a serious position were not even made eligible for sale under this program. I am sure I state the intent of this body when I say that Public Law 480 was intended to alleviate serious surplus problems, regardless of whether the products were actually owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It may be well for us to give some attention to a clearer definition of the commodities which should be made available for sale under Public Law 480.

Because of the uncertainties when the act was written, it authorized the sale of \$700 million worth of farm products over a 3-year period. There was no limitation on the amount which could be used during the first year. Arbitrarily a ceiling of \$453 million was set for the first year, and that amount was committed during the first 4 months of operation. The \$453 million worth of sales represents Commodity Credit Corporation investments. The market values represented in the sales, therefore, will amount to only approximately \$350 million.

We drafted the bill in such a way that we assumed the \$700 million would be committed as rapidly as possible within the safeguards provided. We hoped to avoid the past paternal practice of arbitrarily doling out allocations of the funds by countries. We hoped funds would be available to all friendly countries, who could thereby increase their total imports of farm products in exchange for an equivalent value to the United States.

I understand that offers to buy, from countries with whom agreements have been made, have been reduced; and I further understand that offers from other countries, which might otherwise qualify, have been denied, in order to keep within this arbitrary ceiling. Now that some experience has been accumulated, we may suggest that the authority be increased and the intent clarified.

USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

One of the most important aspects of the implementation of the law is the use made by our Government of the foreign currencies which accrue from the sale of farm products. It is too early to

give a statistical summary on the use of the foreign currencies which under this program accrue to the United States. However, it may be well to reemphasize that "the agricultural trade development" in the title of the act was to apply to title I, and it should be implemented in that sense. It has seemed to me that in Government quarters there is a strong tendency to use these currencies to supplement foreign-aid programs which were not authorized by the Congress.

Furthermore, if I understand the matter correctly, the National Advisory Council on Monetary and Advisory Problems decided that the foreign currencies should not be used for loans to promote multilateral trade, as the act provides. The funds are therefore used to promote nationalism and national self-sufficiency, which deaden trade. I hope this body will not be called upon to appropriate new funds for purposes which otherwise might have been provided for through the use of foreign currencies.

I believe it should be made clear that these foreign currencies, which cannot be used to buy or contract for materials for stockpiling or for the payment of United States obligations abroad, should be used as a revolving fund for making short-term loans to expand international trade and to promote economic development until they can be used for these purposes. Their use should emphasize expanding the total trade and production for trade of all free nations. I do understand that a rather large proportion of the currencies are being loaned to the governments for constructive purposes, on terms which protect the interest of the United States to the limits which could be reasonably expected, and that the currencies received by the United States in repayment of these loans may be used for any of the purposes provided in the act. This makes sense.

The actual mechanics for making sales under Public Law 480 have disturbed me somewhat. The negotiations for the sales are made by a committee representing many Government agencies. The businesslike sales aspects of the transactions become enmeshed with various elements of foreign aid and international political problems quite unrelated to marketing farm products. Private trade plays a subordinate role. It was the intent of the act to remove only the dollar shortage limitations on sales of surplus farm products abroad.

Mr. President, it was hoped that within the broad framework of negotiations covering the safeguards and uses of currencies provided in the act, such sales would be negotiated and consummated by private traders. This does not seem to be the case. I understand that each program must go through all the governmental machinery, largely dominated by the Department of State, and the private traders are engaged as little more than forwarders to deliver the products after the governments work out the details. It even goes beyond this. Before each sale can be made under the act, prior clearance must be obtained from each competing exporting nation. This clearance involves the consent of each

other exporting nation to the sale we propose to make and a statement that they do not wish to make the sale.

Almost every major competitor in the production of every major crop that I know of operates a government or quasi-government monopoly, and deals in various nonorthodox practices of trade and currency manipulations. The procedure for making "prior clearances" with competing exporting nations would be acceptable if it were reciprocal among competing exporters. That is, it would not be so bad if these competing exporters who indulge in government export monopolies, currency manipulations, and the acceptance of foreign currencies, asked for similar prior clearance from the United States.

Such reciprocity is certainly not in prospect, and it would be rather awkward in procedure. For the prior clearance on sales to apply only to the United States is humiliating and must certainly impair the prestige of the United States in the eyes of foreigners.

In our consideration of means for improvement in the operation of Public Law 480 it may be well for the Congress to consider the advisability of separating the administration of title I, the sales program, and title II, the giveaway program.

One approach to consider is that the sales program be handled largely through the Export-Import Bank of Washington. I should think that it would be possible to work out procedures with adequate safeguards to protect our markets and world prices through the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The bank might be authorized to make a special type of short-term loan, for the purpose of expanding imports of agricultural products to be repayable in foreign currency. It could be authorized that these currencies be made available for the purchase of basic materials for the United States stockpiles, or for payment of United States obligations abroad. If there were no materials available to purchase or contract for and no United States obligations, the bank could then use these currencies as a revolving fund for short-term loans to expand trade and to increase production for trade until the funds could be repatriated to the United States either directly or through other countries in materials or payment of United States foreign obligations. I hope this possibility will be carefully examined.

Title II of the act, dealing with giveaway, should be administered separately with adequate safeguards to protect agricultural markets. Reports have come to my attention which have alerted me to the dangers to the markets from indiscriminate giveaways. I believe we can all agree that it is not the place of the State Department to deal in business transactions. As I view it, it is beneath the dignity of the Department to do so; yet in the implementation of Public Law 480, the State Department has become embroiled in the minutest details of individual transactions. This matter should be looked into.

Mr. President, about \$25 million of CCC capital will be spent this year un-

der Public Law 480 to pay ocean freight in dollars, which might otherwise be paid in foreign currency, because of cargo preference for American-flag vessels. Let me make it clear that I do not oppose a subsidy to our merchant marine. The cargo-preference act has two important and adverse effects on agriculture.

First. It increases the delivered price of United States farm products sold under Public Law 480, or financed by the Export-Import Bank, by from \$2 to \$8 a ton. This is from 5 cents to 20 cents a bushel. This gives United States farm products a competitive handicap of that amount.

Second. It charges CCC, and therefore the farm program, with a subsidy to the merchant marine.

If the merchant marine needs a subsidy, I am in favor of it, but it should be a direct subsidy, not a subsidy at the expense of United States farm or industrial products, whose competitive position in world markets is handicapped by that subsidy. I feel certain that when we acted on the cargo-preference bill we did not realize the burden thereby imposed was to be borne so heavily by our agriculture. We may wish to reconsider and modify the act.

In summary, the President's first semi-annual report on activities under Public Law 480 is gratifying to the sponsors. Its operation has had a stabilizing, rather than a disrupting, effect on world prices, because it revealed that the United States was to pursue an orderly program for liquidating surplus farm products. The President should be commended for getting the program off to such a fine start on this uncharted course. The shortcomings of the program that have come to light can be easily corrected. The farmers who expected Congress to use the surpluses for constructive purposes can be assured that it can be done, and we should assure them that it will be done.

I should like to present to the Senate detailed recommendations for making the necessary improvements and expanding the authorization after I have studied the operations further.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. When people become a little aggravated because the Government has not disposed of all surplus farm commodities within a short time, they should remember that the Schoepel Act did not go into effect until the latter part of last summer; that it usually takes from 60 to 90 days to set up such a program; that certain problems had to be ironed out between the departments handling the program; and that perhaps there was an inherent desire on the part of one department or another department to look at the situation from the viewpoint of foreign countries as much as from the viewpoint of our own country.

However, I believe that the progress which has been made during the last 2 months under the Schoepel Act, to promote international trade in farm com-

modities, has been little short of marvelous.

I believe, furthermore, that when we passed the legislation, most Senators, including myself, underestimated the potentialities of such a program.

According to newspaper reports this morning, attacks are being made on the Commodity Credit Corporation and on the Department of Agriculture because they have not moved huge quantities of the surplus commodities and have not put all of them on the market at once. It should be remembered that such a procedure would certainly break the world market price.

Furthermore, Mr. President, some of the people who are accusing the administration of dragging its feet in connection with this program know perfectly well that to follow the procedure I have indicated would not only break the world market price, but would break the domestic cotton price and the prices of other commodities, and would certainly hurt our own farmers and the producers in the rest of the world.

I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants have approached the program in a very reasonable fashion, and that a year from now we will realize the full value of the program authorized under the Schoepel Act, and that we will probably find that the authorization in terms of dollars is too small.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

As I said in my remarks, I believe that, with some modifications, some of the dislocations can be worked out satisfactorily.

I genuinely and sincerely feel that progress has been made under the act. Much more can be accomplished. Certainly it has surprised many of the critics of the position we took in trying to dispose of farm surpluses abroad.

I feel that within the next 6 months, with reports coming forward, and with modifications of the act, we can make tremendous strides in reducing our surpluses, and at the same time encourage goodwill toward this country around the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos of what the Senator from Kansas has said, the remarkable progress which has already been made under the program authorized by the Schoepel-Harrison Act, not only has surprised our critics, but perhaps has disconcerted them as well.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 18, which provides for a continuation of the investigation of Communists in Government. I should like to preface my remarks by complimenting the very able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for having submitted the resolution. I know that

in submitting it he was completely sincere and completely honest, and that if it were to be implemented now by intelligent, hard-hitting investigations by the Democrats, it would be a great thing for this country.

However, I am not too hopeful, Mr. President, that this will be done. Originally, when I looked at the resolution and when I saw the names of so many of my Democrat friends subscribed to the resolution, I was extremely happy and I also signed it as a sponsor. I thought it meant, perhaps, an about-face, a backtracking, if you please, and that perhaps we had ended the dreary 20 years of the Harry Dexter White type of treason. As I have said, I was hopeful. Yet in fact it is just a pious resolution; it does not dig out a single Communist; but I felt that perhaps it represented a change of heart on the part of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Last night, however, I picked up the newspaper—and I call this particularly to the attention of the junior Senator from Texas—and read of another great Texan, MARTIN DIES, who had pioneered the task of digging Communists out of Government, who was the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities until he was hounded out of public life by those who piously claimed they were against communism but did not like the way Mr. DIES was doing his work. He is again a Member of the House of Representatives as a Representative at Large from Texas, having been elected by a tremendous vote. He is an outstanding American. He requested that he be made a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in the lowliest spot on that committee, if you please. But the leadership of the Democrat Party said, "No; we shall not put you on that committee," because they knew that MARTIN DIES would continue his fight against communism; they knew his reputation, and his record for digging out Communists.

For that reason, Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Texas [MR. DANIEL] that, while I know he is completely honest and sincere and completely anti-Communist, yet when I read the story about the continued attempt to break MARTIN DIES, I realize that, even though there are some excellent Senators and Representatives in the Democrat Party, it is still in the control of those who for 20 years coddled, covered up, and promoted the Harry Dexter White type of treason.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech which I made on March 19, 1954, documenting 20 instances of treason.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOE MCCARTHY MARCH 19, 1954, PLANKINTON HOTEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Thank you, Young Republicans, for the opportunity to be with you at this dinner commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Republican Party. I feel that this gathering of young Republicans is an especially appropriate place to answer the attacks made upon the Republican Party and me by Adlai.

I would like to thank WGN-WISN and the great number of independent radio stations which are making it possible for me to bring this message to such a large audience. As you know, two major networks, NBC and CBS, carried Stevenson's attack upon the Republican administration and me from coast to coast free of charge as what they called a public service. As you know, they refused to allow me the time to answer his attacks. A sizable number of independent stations, apparently recognizing the dangerous precedent of giving nationwide time for the attack but none for the answer, have given me tonight completely free of charge time on their radio stations for this answer to Adlai, even though there was no obligation to do so on their part.

Now let's move on to Adlai. First let me quote a passage to you and see if you recognize its origin:

"The struggle against McCarthyism is objectively a struggle against the policies of the Republican administration."

"The McCarthyites run interference for the Republican administration on unpopular issues, undertaking to build mass support for new moves to the right. McCARTHY's position today becomes Eisenhower's position tomorrow. Precisely because it plays this role, McCarthyism is nurtured and encouraged by the Republican administration."

Does that sound familiar? Did you hear it over the air the other night from the Democrat rally which was addressed by Adlai in Florida. No, you are wrong, you did not. While the meaning is the same this is not the exact language used by Adlai. This is a verbatim quote from a report delivered at the national conference of the Communist Party of the United States and published in 1953. Now let me quote one of the three main objectives as set forth to the national conference of the Communist Party. I quote from page 82:

"To elect an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthyite-McCarranite candidate, especially singling out for defeat those who are incumbents, and by electing a powerful bloc of conscious and determined fighters against McCarthyism."

Just one more quote from the Communist rule book. On page 32 we find mapped out the method of attacking McCARTHY:

"1. Make it a struggle against witch-hunting investigations."

"2. Defend the victims of McCarthyism such as Lattimore."

"3. Make direct attacks on McCARTHY himself such as the ADA's demand for investigation of McCARTHY."

A short paraphrase from page 15 of the Communist orders: We must intervene actively and aggressively in all differences between Eisenhower and McCARTHY directing the sharpest fire against McCARTHY but don't support Ike either.

Does that sound a bit familiar? I repeat, this is not a quote from Adlai's Miami speech. While the meaning is the same the language is taken from the main report delivered at the National Conference of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and published in 1953 by the Communist Party, as orders to its members.

Two weeks ago Adlai, acting as spokesman and defense lawyer for the Democrat Party, used the officially approved and published Communist method of attacking McCARTHY and the Republican Party. He complained that I referred to 20 years of treason. Tonight I shall place before the greatest of all juries, the American people, an indictment of 20 counts, picked at random, which added together at best constitute gross stupidity—or at worst, treason. This does not make up the entire picture, but just 20 counts in the indictment picked at random.

As I read this indictment you decide what the cost was in dollars and in blood and death and grief. There is scarcely one of you who hear me but has had some personal tragedy linked to these acts of infamy.

Twenty years of treason—20 deeds of betrayal.

Count No. 1 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Let us call as a witness that greatest of all Americans, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He testified before the Russell committee that when the Chinese Communists were pouring across the Yalu River bridges, he immediately ordered the bombing of those bridges to keep the Reds from pouring across the river to kill, cripple, capture, and then torture to death the sons of American mothers as they did. MacArthur testified: "But that order was countermanded from Washington." How many Americans died because that order was countermanded no one will ever know; that many died because of it, no one can question.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 2 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In 1943, Adlai was given the task of formulating America's postwar policy for Italy. That policy according to the sworn testimony of Gen. Bedell Smith was to connive to bring Communists into the Italian Government and to bring the Communist leader, Togliatti, back from Moscow. Why did Adlai want the Communist leader brought back from Moscow to Italy where he has since done so much damage?

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 3 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Dropping back 20 years to November 1933, one of the first acts of the Democrat administration was to recognize Soviet Russia. This recognition of Russia, says Whittaker Chambers, laid the United States open to foreign espionage. And it may not be without significance that according to a speech made on the Senate floor on May 16, 1933, Dean Acheson had for awhile been the Washington lawyer for Communist Russia.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 4 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: May 19, 1942, with Adlai as special assistant in the Navy Department, the White House ruled that members of the Communist conspiracy were to be allowed to act as radio operators on either commercial or naval vessels.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 5 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: October 12, 1942, Lauchlin Currie, who has been named under oath as a Red spy and who was executive assistant to the President, arranged for Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party in the United States, to confer with the State Department so that he might guide the betrayal of China.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 6 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The deliberate betrayal of our fighting ally, the militantly anti-Communist Mihailovich, in Yugoslavia, in favor of Communist Tito. The result: A Communist Yugoslavia.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 7 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The secret Army directive which authorized the granting of commissions in the United States Army to members of the Communist conspiracy.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 8 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: The order to destroy the files on military personnel where the files showed that he was a Communist. Proof of this order is contained in this letter from Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who kept the order from being fully carried out.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 9 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: We gave Russia our currency plates with no control over the amount of American-backed currency which they could print. The cost to American taxpayers: Over \$250 million. The perpetrators: The Communist espionage agent, Harry Dexter White, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and V. Frank Coe. Recently before our committee he refused on the grounds of self-incrimination to tell whether or not he was engaged in running guns to the Communists. Incidentally, here is a letter in which Coe recommended Adlai to an important assignment.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 10 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Yalta. There millions of free men, women, and children were sold into Communist slavery. As our Ambassador to Poland said at the time: "As I looked over the [Yalta] agreement I could not believe my eyes. Every line spoke a complete surrender to the Communists." One of those helped draft the agreement—Alger Hiss—who years before that had been identified in FBI reports as a Communist spy. As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 11 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In the sell-out to the Communist conspiracy; the loan of \$90 million of American money to the Communist-controlled government in Poland while the battle between the Communists and the anti-Communists in Poland was still touch and go. Your 90 million bought the guns, the ammunition, the whips, and the black snakes which beat a free people into reluctant, bloody submission. And who granted the loan—Dean Gooderham Acheson. And whose firm represented the Communist—the law firm of the same Dean Gooderham Acheson.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 12 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In 1945 our friends in China desperately needed guns and ammunition to fight off the Communists. At the same time we had in our possession mountains of captured guns and ammunition which our China allies so badly needed. General Eisenhower and his advisers ordered a vast amount of that material sent to our friends in China. Then what happened? There came an order written on White House stationery signed by Lauchlin Currie ordering that none of that material go to our friends in China—Lauchlin Currie who has been repeatedly named under oath as a member of the Communist spy ring, was the former President's assistant with an office in the White House.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 13 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Just a few months ago the man who had been acting chairman of the loyalty program of the Government Printing Office testified under oath that the head of Truman's loyalty program ordered them not to discharge any of their employees merely because they were Communists. This was the order of Truman's loyalty chief, even though certain workers in the Government Printing Office had access to the topmost secret material from almost every agency in government—Army, Navy, Air Corps, Atomic Energy, hydrogen bomb information, etc., secret material which if in enemy hands might well decree the death of this Nation. This policy of "don't take Communists away from the Nation's secrets—let them hold a razor poised over the arteries carrying the lifeblood of the Nation"—applied not merely to the Printing Office, but to every Federal agency because the order came from Seth Richardson who was Truman's top dog in the entire loyalty program. Unbelievable you say—yes.

Impossible you say—yes, but all a matter of cold record. As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai, guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 14 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: A Federal grand jury presentment released on December 2, 1952, in discussing Communists in the United Nations had this to say:

"Almost without exception these same subversive employees with the United Nations were formerly employed in various departments of our own Federal Government. They were transferred from one Federal department to another, finally ending up in key positions in the United Nations. The evidence shows this is not coincidental but part of a definite, planned pattern. It appears to result from the contrivance of certain highly placed officials who have surrounded themselves in each Government agency, and then in the United Nations, with personnel who share their disloyal convictions."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 15 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: While the Republic of China, which had fought side by side with us during the entire war, was in a life and death struggle with the Russian supported Chinese Communists we embargoed the shipment of even one ounce of gunpowder to that ally of ours.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 16 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: While conducting an air-tight embargo on the shipment of any of the weapons of war to the Republic of China we were forcing the opening of Kalgan mountain pass into Manchuria with the result that the Chinese Communists could be and were fully armed by the Russians.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 17 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Immediately following the outbreak of the Korean war the United States Seventh Fleet was ordered to patrol the waters along the Communist coast of China. Their orders:

1. Sink any ship which attempts to go from Formosa to help those who are fighting the Communists in China, but do not molest or in any way interfere with ships helping the Communists.

2. Do not let the Chinese Navy on Formosa sink any Communist shipping. As Ambassador Bullitt testified:

"Our Government has given orders to our fleet to prevent it [the navy of the anti-Communist Chinese] from stopping the Communist supply ships going up to Korea. They sail right by Formosa, loaded with Soviet munitions put in the Polish Communist ships in Gdynia. They come all the way around and go right by Formosa and sail past there, taking weapons up to be used to kill American soldiers in Korea, and by order of our Government the Chinese Navy is flatly forbidden to stop them on their way up there."

As President Eisenhower pointed out, "This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. * * * This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 18 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: Starting in 1939, official reports gave the State Department information showing that Alger Hiss was a member of the Communist conspiracy. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, he rose rapidly up the ladder until he was head of the Policy and Planning Division of the State Department and finally was made the Secretary General for the organization of the United

Nations at San Francisco. Hiss' file showed he was a Red spy at the time he was picked for this job.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 18 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: In the sellout to the Communist conspiracy. During the Korean war, President Truman sent his personal friend, General Lowe, to act as his eyes and ears in Korea. In fairness to Truman, it should be made clear that General Lowe's reports were intercepted either in the Pentagon or somewhere else in Washington and never reached Truman. When Lowe returned to the United States, here is what he had to say:

"General MacArthur was right in Korea, and if he'd been left alone he long since would have won in Korea. What we face now is a disgraceful stalemate, the writing off of tens of thousands of needless American casualties, the loss of face throughout the entire oriental world and a pointless, undefined position for ourselves. MacArthur was hamstrung and finally brought down by the interference of the State Department."

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

Count No. 20 in the indictment for treason or gross stupidity: On March 10, 1953, General Van Fleet, who had been the Commanding General of our Armies in Korea appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He was being questioned by Senator Byrd:

Question by Senator Byrd: "You were quoted, I think, General, in the newspapers as saying on two occasions that you could have gained a military victory in Korea; is that correct?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "In June of 1951, we had the Communist armies on the run: They were hurting badly, out of supplies, completely out of hand or control; they were in a panic, and were doing their best to fall as far back as possible, and we stopped by order, did not pursue to finish the enemy."

Question by Senator Byrd: "Did you recommend that the attack be continued?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "Oh, yes. I was crying to have them turn us loose."

Question by Senator Byrd: "If you had had the authority to go ahead and pursue the enemy as far as you could, what would have been the results?"

Answer by General Van Fleet: "I believe we would have gotten all his heavy equipment and perhaps two or three hundred thousand prisoners."

Ask yourselves, my friends, who in Washington refused to let the general in the field win the victory when he reported to them, "We had the Communist armies on the run, they were hurting badly, out of supplies, completely out of hand or control; they were in a panic." How many American boys died because this great general was instructed not to win. How many will die in the future, no man knows.

As attorney for the defense, how plead you to this count, Adlai? Guilty or not guilty?

If these 20 counts picked at random from the record of the two decades between March 4, 1933, and January 20, 1953, do not add up to treason, then I ask you, my friends, what is treason?

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the facts—every one backed by proof and official reports. You be the judge. Is it treason? If not what is it?

Those who would defend that record dare not do so directly. They condemn investigations and techniques. Anyone can be a hero of this left-wing gang if he shouts about liberty and freedom and coercion. The lower the hypocrite the more general the terms, and the greater the condemnation and the louder the clash of cymbals by those who call themselves righteous. If the cries came from the Communists alone, no one

would listen. But cleverly—oh so cleverly—they add the voices of the fellow-travelers, of the ill-informed and of the egg-headed liberals. Many, far too many, of those who scream are but politicians seeking temporary glory, unmindful of the truth of the past, careless of the future, unworried about the destiny of our Nation.

Adlai turned some fine phrases at Miami. A great number of high sounding general statements, but safely devoid of facts except in one instance in which case the statement of fact was false. Apparently Adlai would rather turn a clever phrase than to be truthful. His one statement of fact was that the Republicans had gotten rid of only one Communist. And, of course, the audience applauded. I am not going to try to give you the names tonight of every Communist removed since the American people got rid of Adlai's friends, Truman and Acheson. I will, however, give you the names of 20 of the many fifth-amendment Communists who appeared before our committee and were then removed from Government or defense work. The 20 whose names I shall give you were all working either in the Government or in defense plants which handled secret material for the military at the time our committee called them. Their names: Doris W. Powell, Robert Goodwin, Edward Rothschild, Nathaniel Mills, Henry C. Archdeacon, Donald H. Morrill, Witulad Plekarski, Ruth Levin, Alexander Gregory, Theodore Pappas, Victor Bolys, Irving Peress, Sidney Friedlander, Robert P. Northrop, Arthur L. Owens, Joseph A. Gebhardt, Emanuel Fernandez, Gordon Belgrave, Dewey F. Brashear, and Leo Kantrowitz.

I assume I shall read in tomorrow's paper that McCARTHY said only 20 fifth-amendment Communists were removed from Government. Let me make it clear I picked at random only 20 of those who appeared before our investigating committee, refused to tell whether they were Communists on the ground the truth might send them to jail, and then were removed from Government or from defense plants which handled secret work.

But Adlai says: "Isn't this McCarthyism a nasty thing to dare expose all those innocent fifth-amendment Communists." Fortunately, the American people, with their sure instinct for what is right, voted against this man and his party. For only Republican leadership could have torn aside the curtain of silence and concealment to reveal the depths to which our Nation had fallen. And the louder the agonized cries from the leftwing, the faster and harder we shall work. We will not rest until every Communist is brought to light and to justice. Yes, Adlai, a single disloyal, dangerous employee is one too many.

Adlai shed crocodile tears because I demanded the names of those in the Pentagon who knew that Communists were active in the military.

He cleverly tried to make this look as though I were attacking that great patriotic group of Americans all the way from privates to generals who have done so much for our Nation.

Adlai knew that our investigating committee has been digging out the few rotten apples in the barrel. Especially am I interested in finding those who knew of the rotten apples, the Communists, and promoted, coddled, and failed to remove them.

Yesterday Defense Secretary Wilson confirmed what I have so often said, namely, that someone in the Pentagon knew about each and every Communist we exposed before we exposed them. Unfortunately, they were not removed until brought before our committee. No matter how great the walling of Adlai—no matter how cleverly the Pentagon politicians (carryovers from the Truman regime) use honest innocents like Bob Stevens who are lost in the maze of

Washington confusion—no matter how hard they try to divert the exposure of Communists into a personal fight between the administration and me, all of the facts will finally be dug out and given to you, the American people.

The enemy's ranks are closing. They are going all out to rally support—from their stalwarts, from the bleeding hearts, from the well-meaning liberals, and from chameleon politicians of both parties. They strive to hamstring our investigations.

In an effort to tie our hands, they will ask for different rules for committees investigating Communists—as if Communists were less dangerous than waste or stupidity. They will demand that there be 2 or 3 or 4 Senators at all hearings: an obvious impossibility for me to order Senators to appear. Anyone who has had any experience with Congress will tell you that there would be no quicker way to stall investigations, for Senators must serve on a great number of committees.

There will be other tactics to slow our progress. Can anyone in this audience think of any reason why rules and procedures which have been good enough for committees investigating graft and corruption should not be good enough to rout out traitors and subversives.

During these days when the abuse and imprecations reach a new crescendo I very greatly miss the moral support which I so long received from that tower of integrity and strength in the Republican Party who no longer is with us—Senator Robert A. Taft—no chameleon was he.

Don't let them fool you, America. If those of us who are exposing the Communists are stopped here and now, the Communists can win. Their crafty conspirators can lie in wait until their friends and protectors take over. They are trained to wait; they have orders to wait—orders from Moscow. Now is the time to redouble our efforts—and with all the energy of mind and body which God gave me, I pledge you that I shall continue no matter how high or low are the Democrats or the Republicans who scream their maledictions at me, and shout that I am not gentle enough in trying to drag the truth from traitors and their protectors. To relax the search now would be to admit defeat. This we shall never do. The truth we shall get; the truth the American people shall have.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say, in conclusion, that I hope I am wrong about what is happening. I hope the Democrat Party is ready to make an about-face. I hope it is ready to follow the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Texas. If it is, it will be a great thing for this country.

Mr. President, I read the names of the Senators who cosponsored the resolution and those who voted for it, and I could not help thinking of the man who continually made excellent speeches against the evils of liquor, and then went out and got drunk every night after his speeches.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his remarks concerning the sincerity of the junior Senator from Texas in submitting Senate Resolution 18, which has just been passed by a unanimous vote. I am more hopeful than is the Senator from Wisconsin in this matter. I join in his hope that he is wrong in his lack of hope.

Mr. President, I have regretted on several occasions hearing the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been such an outspoken foe of the Communist conspiracy,

referring to the Democratic Party as a party of treason—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield at that point.

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have been misquoted on that subject so often that I should like to set the record straight. I have always said that the millions of loyal Americans who have disliked communism and voted the Democrat ticket have loved America just as much as have the Republicans. I have also said that there were Senators on the Democrat side of the aisle who were just as anti-Communist as are those on the Republican side.

But I also have pointed out that there were 20 years of treason, the Harry Dexter White type of treason. I think the Senator from Texas will agree with me that the handling of that case involved treason on the part of someone—certainly treason on the part of Harry Dexter White, who was a top official in the Democrat administration. But I have tried to make it clear that I have never labeled all Democrat officeholders as being even remotely treasonable. The Truman-Acheson branch of the Democrat Party certainly has coddled, covered up, and nurtured treason. We cannot get away from that fact. That is just as clear as is the fact that we both stand here today.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Wisconsin always would narrow his comment so as to indicate exactly what Democrats he refers to, rather than speaking about the entire Democratic Party in this matter. There are those of us in the Democratic Party, and, I would say, a good majority, who regretted deeply the handling of the Harry Dexter White case and many other cases. I think if we would particularize the cases, and not overstate them, and pinpoint the exact facts and circumstances and the responsible people, we could, in both parties, unite against such instances and happenings.

I entertained the hope that after the adoption of the resolution today, we would have a united front in the Senate, and I still believe we will. The Senator from Wisconsin has said nothing that would prevent that. I sincerely hope we shall have a united front against the Communist conspiracy, and that we shall be united in the support of our committees in carrying on their investigations of subversion in this country. I have complete confidence that the committee of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is chairman, and of which the Senator from Wisconsin is a member, will complete the unfinished and pending cases with dispatch, and that the Senate during this session will be just as vigorous and diligent against the Communist conspiracy as it has ever been in its history. The controversy recently disposed of may be partially responsible for restoring unity to this body in the fight against our common foe, the Communist conspiracy.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that Representative MARTIN DIES is a great foe of the Communist conspiracy. He did wonderful work on his origi-

nal Un-American Activities Committee. I wish it had been possible for him to be restored to membership on that committee. However, I do not know the situation at the other end of the Capitol. It is possible that the matter of seniority or other valid considerations prevented his being restored to that committee. I am sure the action was not due to any sympathy for communism on the part of the House leadership or the new appointee on the House committee. They are as much opposed to the Communist conspiracy as are we.

We have no responsibility for the House committees. Our resolution refers only to the Senate and its committees. The Senate today has expressed itself as united in its determination to continue diligently and vigorously to fight the Communist conspiracy.

Carrying out the terms of Senate Resolution 18 would not be an about-face on the part of the majority of the members of the Democratic Party. It is a work in which the majority of the members of my party are as interested as are the Senator from Wisconsin and the members of his party.

If all of us will try our best to support the committee, which will now be headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and on which the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin will sit and contribute greatly, as well as our other appropriate committees, I believe we can accomplish something against the common foe.

It was in that spirit that I offered the resolution. Further, I want to make it clear that the fact that some of us criticized the actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin with reference to his relations and attitude toward certain committees did not mean that we were going soft on Communists or that we were against the work and the objective in which the Senator has always stated he was interested, namely, digging out and rooting from the Government any Communists and others who were following the Communist line.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be absolutely clear, so far as I am concerned, if the Democrat Party were controlled by persons like the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] or the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I am certain that the Senator from Texas would not have to follow through on the resolution which he submitted and which was voted on today.

At this point, however, I am firmly convinced—and it is an unhappy thought—that there are not enough men like the Senator from Texas in the Democrat Party. The control still is held by the same group of persons who were responsible for the 20 long, dreary years of the Harry Dexter Whites and the Alger Hisses.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Wisconsin speak of the Democratic control on this side of the aisle?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of the Democrat Party.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, but the investigation of Communists by Senate committees will be controlled by the Democratic

membership, Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope it will be. The discipline of the Senator's party is much greater than that of my party. I saw a typical example of that not too long ago when I observed Senators vote on a certain matter and then heard them say later that they held their noses while they voted.

I doubt very much that the policy of the Democrat Party will be ignored by Democrat Senators.

Mr. DANIEL. I have not felt the whip of discipline on this side of the aisle. Neither have I observed its application to other Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The Senator from Wisconsin will remember that I was independent in my vote in the last general election. I voted for President Eisenhower. But members of the Democratic caucus here in the Senate certainly did not discipline me, but treated me well.

I wish the junior Senator from Wisconsin could leave the Chamber today convinced of the fact that Senate Democrats are not controlled by what might be thought up or planned in the Democratic National Committee or in the minds of those outside the Senate Chamber to whom the Senator from Wisconsin has referred.

Since participating in the activities of the party on this side of the aisle for 2 years I have observed no discipline or control over the Senate Democratic leadership by outside political leaders or Democratic National Committee officials. The Senator from Wisconsin might feel much better about the matter if he would simply believe these facts which I know to be true.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been active in the work of fighting Communists for a long time—a rather bloody long time. Day after day I have seen politicians on the stump waving their arms, saying they were against communism, but always speaking in only the most general terms. But when it came down to the specific task, the dirty job—and it is a very dirty job—of digging out individual Communists in Government, they just did not like anyone who exposed or dug out Communists.

That is what confronts us today. We have now adopted a resolution which, in general terms, states that we are against communism. Such a resolution is meaningless except as a political gesture. I think some of those who sponsored the resolution were trying to get some dirt off their hands. I am not referring to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I regret that the Senator from Wisconsin would make such a statement about other sponsors of the resolution.

Let us assume that all other Senators had the same good intention in the wording of the resolution the junior Senator from Wisconsin and I have.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot assume that when I look at the names of Senators who have voted to put up the fight they did against anyone who has dug out Communists.

When I find a Senator who has voted for this pious resolution, and I then

check his record and find that he is against anyone who tries to implement this type of resolution, I cannot give him credit for being sincere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The Chair is compelled to call the junior Senator from Wisconsin to order. His remarks are contrary to the Senate rules, and he must take his seat.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not understand the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the junior Senator from Wisconsin was that other Senators were insincere. In making that statement, the Senator from Wisconsin spoke contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask that the junior Senator from Wisconsin may proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin may not speak.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I move that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, that I may finish my statement?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly appreciate having the Chair follow the rules so closely. I observed the present Presiding Officer, when he was seated on his side of the aisle within the last 2 or 3 months while every rule of the Senate was violated, and he never once opened his mouth.

I was being criticized and accused of everything but murdering my great-grandmother, but the junior Senator from Louisiana, who now occupies the chair, sat in his seat on his side of the aisle like a bump on a log. He was not worried then about the Senate rules.

When I started calling the attention of the Senate and the country to the truth of these facts, the Chair suddenly remembered the Senate rules. I am glad to observe that the Chair remembers the rules now; I hope he will remember them in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair desires to make a statement. As a Senator, he has been called to order on the floor for saying far less than that other Members of the Senate were trying to remove dirt from their hands or that other Members of this body were insincere.

Mr. DANIEL. May we not end the discussion with the hope that the junior Senator from Wisconsin expressed in his original remarks, namely, that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is wrong, and that the junior Senator from Texas is right, about the intention of the Senate committees and the leadership of the Senate in investigating and fighting the Communist conspiracy?

Would the junior Senator from Wisconsin agree that we might end on that note of hope for ultimate unity, at least?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Texas agree with me that our hopes were badly dashed when the Democrat leadership decreed that MARTIN DIES, the greatest Communist hunter of all, and the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, could not now have even the lowest position on that committee? The Democrat leadership was afraid to have him on that committee. That being the case, I am not too hopeful about what the Democrat leadership will do in trying to guide the Senate in its fight against communism.

Mr. DANIEL. I regret, with the junior Senator from Wisconsin, that MARTIN DIES was not named to membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But my hopes are not dashed at all, because I have no reason to believe that the Democratic leadership in the House is afraid to have MARTIN DIES on the committee. I believe we shall see the fight continued, and that the pending, uncompleted cases now before the Senate committees will be investigated with dispatch. I have faith in the committee. Certainly I hope that will be done.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am delighted to learn that my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, has refreshed his memory with respect to rule XIX, section 2, which I observed was so willfully and grossly violated on the floor of the Senate, not once, but dozens of times, during the terrible tragedy which we had in the Senate a couple of months ago.

I assure the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Louisiana, that he has also refreshed my memory, and that we are going to play the game according to the rules. From this time forward, three strikes will be "out."

To the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas, I may say that I was happy and honored to be permitted to be a cosponsor of his resolution. Like the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I pray that it will succeed in accomplishing its purpose. I pray that all the shooting at one another in the Senate will stop. We have had enough bickering in this body. The Senate of the United States has suffered, regardless of who won the debate a few months ago. The American people are the sole judges.

I beg of my distinguished friend from Texas that he use his potent influence on some of his colleagues and some of his partisans, who have been shooting daily at the Vice President of the United States, calling him a smear artist, and accusing him of calling the loyal Democratic Party a party of treason. I have not heard such statements from him, and I crossed campaign trails with him many times.

It is time for us to get back to work on the Communist conspiracy. It was my pleasure to have served on the committee with the great former chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who has been succeeded by a great Dem-

ocrat, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

I know that our committee will act without one iota of partisanship, just as it has in the past under the distinguished Senator from Indiana. It will fight to save the United States from the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hisses, and other such persons, who have been all too prevalent in our Government.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that I recall that not so many years ago the then President of the United States, President Truman, said that the Republican Party was giving aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy. I did not hear all this crying and weeping and wailing then. But whenever the junior Senator from Wisconsin says one word, it seems to me that opens up the shotguns aimed in his direction. Let us get back to business. I join with the Senator from Texas. He will never find me playing in left field unless I have a glove on.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Idaho will agree that no one has opened up a shotgun from across the aisle today, will he not? Let us open up our shotguns against the common foe and not at each other.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. The fight against communism is not a simple matter. All of our problems of government stem primarily from the issue of communism. Our unbalanced budgets, deficit spending, military costs, costs of defense, foreign policy, aid programs, high taxes—all of the problems that are paramount in this country stem from the threat of communism, not only to this Nation, but to the entire world. During the past 2 years I was honored to head the Internal Security Subcommittee, and I certainly wish to pay tribute to the Democrats who were on that subcommittee. The subcommittee was founded by a great Democrat, Senator McCarran. That subcommittee has never dealt in partisanship. I think every report the committee submitted has been a unanimous report.

I remember that at the end of the last session, in the heat and passion of the consideration of the proposed McCarthy censure, a resolution similar to that of the Senator from Texas was submitted as an amendment. I objected. I objected primarily because I thought it was injecting politics into the issue of communism, where it has no place. I did not think that was the time to bring up a resolution of that type, at the end of the heated debate, probably the most heated debate that has ever been held in this Chamber.

I join now with the coauthor of the resolution. From what I have learned in talking with the coauthor, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], it is a comprehensive resolution. The resolution covers all phases of the Communist conspiracy, not only Communists in government, because it reads:

It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and

combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith.

In other words, the author assures me, and I am sure it was so understood when we voted unanimously to agree to the resolution, that we were not going to confine the investigation to any one phase, or to any organization directly connected with the Communist conspiracy, because that is hard to prove. For example, Harold Glasser was taken out of the American Communist apparatus and put directly under the Soviet Embassy's control. Thereafter, Harold Glasser could easily say, "I have no connection with the Communist conspiracy in America—," and he did not have, because his orders came directly from Moscow, through the Soviet Embassy, and he was no longer an American Communist in the American Government.

The resolution is an all-encompassing one. I hope, with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the issue will not become a partisan one, and that now, when the Democratic Party is in control, we shall go forward with this all-important investigation.

We may talk until we are blue in the face, but the written record and our actions will speak louder than words. So time alone will tell, I say to the Senator. Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I merely wish to say that a year from today I intend to rise and review the progress of the Democrat Party's investigation.

Mr. JENNER. Only time will tell. Actions will speak louder than words.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I want to recall to the Senate the manner in which the junior Senator from California cast his vote on the several rollcall votes which were taken in November. I think the manner in which I cast my vote on that occasion gives me a particular and a special right to give my sincere congratulations to the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is now in the Chair. Because I happen to be a Member of the United States Senate, I want the debate to be as vigorous and decisive and keen as it ought to be, but I want it to be conducted courteously, and upon a plane which is commensurate with the dignity which all my life I have associated with this highest parliamentary body in the Government of the United States.

So to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is presently presiding, I give my congratulations and my friendship for enforcing, as I would want him to enforce them, the rules of conduct of the Senate of our country, and I align myself with him completely—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, in the future every Member of the Senate—I repeat, every Member of the Senate—ought to take upon himself the responsibility of measuring his own words as he debates issues in this Chamber, and of seeing to

it that he and the other 95 Senators conduct themselves courteously and with dignity as the rules provide.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly appreciate this outburst of self-righteousness today on the part of the Senator from California—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be made to take his seat, under rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has yielded for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I rise to a point of order that the remark of the Senator from Wisconsin is not a proper question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator if he was present in the Senate Chamber during the debate in November? Did he hear the rules of the Senate violated, not once, not a dozen times, but a hundred times—

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say—

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my question, please. Was the Senator aware of the fact that I requested all of my friends not to call anyone to order? I said, "Let them get it off their chests. Let them say what they want to say." I did not ask the Senator from California to call for order. Did the junior Senator from California at any time attempt to call those Senators to order? Before the Senator answers me, I say to the Senator, that, so far as I am concerned, I intend to call a spade a spade at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has yielded for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say this—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Several questions have been asked. I shall try to answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I wish to say that in the 2 years I have sat in the Senate, I have heard Members of the Senate repeatedly and on many occasions break rules. I have listened to some comments, I may say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, upon the part of Senators on both sides of the aisle that to my mind were not in keeping with the manner in which debate in what is sometimes called the Upper House of Congress should be conducted; and I take my share of responsibility for failing to invoke the rule which was invoked just a short while ago. The junior Senator from Wisconsin may speak frankly, as I know he will, but I think the time has come when we ought not to indulge in personal animadversions on the floor of the Senate, no matter what the discussions may concern. That is my answer to the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator agree with me that there is no halo that surrounds anyone on these thrones? Will the Senator agree with me that if Senator X knew that Senator Y had done something improper, had done something wrong, and had not properly

represented his people, Senator X would have a duty to stand on the floor of the Senate and tell the Senate and the country about the improper conduct on the part of Senator Y? May I say that—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has asked a question. I want to answer—

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. Go ahead and answer that part of the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Of course, I agree that a Senator has the responsibility of disclosing any information which he has which would be of assistance to the people of the United States in arriving at sound conclusions, and if the facts should reflect upon the Senate, obviously it would nevertheless be a Senator's responsibility and duty to take such action. I am talking about a rule of the United States Senate which provides for the manner of speaking. I suggest to the Senator that even the vilest types of conduct can be described without resorting to offensive language.

Mr. President, I had not intended to rise and get into a long colloquy. I had intended to rise for one point. I think I had a special right to emphasize it because of the manner in which I cast my vote in November.

I rose for the sole purpose of informing the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], that, as a Republican, I congratulate my friend, a Democrat, for the manner in which he has conducted himself while acting as the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield just once, before he takes his seat?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I know this incident will be labeled an argument or a fight between the Senator from California and myself.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to make it very clear that it is not a fight or an argument, but is a disagreement.

Let me say I think the rules should apply alike to all Senators.

Mr. KUCHEL. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last November, during the special session, I took the position that if any Senator knew of any improper conduct on the part of myself, such Senator should rise and should freely speak his mind. I took the position then that any rule which provides for immunity of a Senator from criticism should not apply, and that there is no halo surrounding our sessions. Apparently the entire Senate agreed with me, for, as I recall, not once was a Senator required to take his seat, although day after day I heard the foulest type of vituperation heaped upon my head—although later it was proved to be completely false.

If the rule then was that if a Senator knew of some improper conduct on the part of another Senator, he should discuss it, why is it suddenly proposed, today, that the rule be changed or shifted

when I start to point out improper conduct on the part of other Senators?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from California to permit me to finish my question. I now say to the Senator from California that he or any other Senator can have me compelled to take my seat, if he wishes to do so; that can be done under rule XIX. But after looking at this list and after listening to the vote, I am utterly convinced that there are those who signed that pious resolution who are opposed to digging out Communists and will oppose anyone who digs out Communists, and who are attempting, as I said, to remove the stench from their hands and the mud from their skirts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Wisconsin will take his seat.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will say that so far as I am concerned, the comments any Senator makes in the future ought to be made having in mind the thought that there is some responsibility that the comments made here be those of gentlemen and of Members of the United States Senate, and that there are rules which guide us.

Mr. President, it is true that during the entire time I have been a Member of the Senate, many times rule XIX has not been invoked. But in the future it is going to be invoked, and it should be. I am glad it has been invoked today, because I am completely and sincerely devoted to the maintenance of the prestige, and the reputation of the Senate and the manner in which the business of the Senate ought to be conducted; and I intend to do my part in seeing to it that the debate is conducted in accordance with the rules of decency.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I am certain that what transpired on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago needs no explanation from me.

However, I should like to make clear on the Record the basis on which I felt it necessary to call another Senator to order.

Rule XIX provides, in subsection 2, as follows:

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Subsection 4 of Senate rule XIX provides as follows:

4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana has had that rule invoked against him by motion of other Senators, never on the initiative of the Chair.

However, the junior Senator from Louisiana interprets rule XIX to mean that it is the right of any Senator to require another Senator to take his seat

when that Senator transgresses the rule, but that it is the duty of the Chair to do so, and that it should not be necessary for a Senator on the floor to exercise that right, because it is the duty of the Chair to see to it that the rules of the Senate are not violated.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has many times felt that the Chair was not as scrupulous in enforcing the rule as the junior Senator from Louisiana would have been if he had been presiding.

I say that, Mr. President, without any reflection on any presiding officer, either in the past or at the present time. It is a matter of opinion of the presiding officer to state when a rule has been violated. There have been instances when the junior Senator from Louisiana has felt that if he were presiding he would consider it to be his duty to invoke the rule.

Mr. President, I agree that there were things said concerning Members of this body in the debate on the resolution of censure which certainly reflected unfavorably upon a Member of this body. But that was in debate on a motion to censure. To say that a Senator could not speak unfavorably of another Senator in debate on a motion to censure would be to say that we could not debate a motion to censure.

Section 5 of article I of the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, and punish its Members for disorderly behavior.

The Constitution of the United States cannot be set aside by the Senate rules. In debating a resolution to censure, it is completely within the rules of the Senate, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, to debate matters germane to that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am pleased to see the Senator from Wisconsin is on the floor, and I wish him to know that I bear him no ill will whatever.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that.

Mr. LONG. He undertook a very vigorous fight on the Communist issue.

I wish him to know that it is my opinion that it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce the rules when they are violated; that a Senator should not be required to invoke the rule, because it is the duty of the Chair to see to it that the rules are obeyed.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana say that he does not bear me any ill will; but the Senator from Louisiana voted that it was censurable to discuss a Senator off the Senate floor. I am becoming more and more disturbed by the idea that some type of halo surrounds the throne of a Senator, that if he is guilty of wrongdoing, it cannot be discussed, or that if he is guilty of graft or corruption or anything else that is improper, it cannot be discussed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the effect of what I said in the only remarks I made on this subject—and I know the

Senator from Wisconsin was present and heard the statement when I made it—was that my feeling on the censure resolution was that if a Senator speaks disparagingly of another Senator and in a way which reflects great discredit upon him, and the matter is brought in issue on the floor of the Senate and no effort is made to prove the charge, the Senator who made the charge must stand condemned by his colleagues because he cannot prove what he said about another Senator. If one Senator accuses another of being unpatriotic, and there is no effort made to prove the charge, it seems to me he stands condemned.

I am not accusing any Senator of any improper conduct. I am simply stating that except when a motion to censure or a motion to punish is being debated, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce rule XIX.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has pointed up a very important subject, and we could discuss it from now on. We are operating under the rule that one Senator cannot expose the wrongdoing of another Senator even off the Senate floor. In other words, there is a new type of immunity.

The Senator from Louisiana voted for that. He may not have read the resolution; I do not know. If not, I hope he will read it in the near future, because it is a rather fantastic document for which he voted. I am not concerned about how it affects me, but it is of importance insofar as the future of the Senate is concerned. I am only suggesting it in view of the position taken by the Democrats, who voted unanimously, whereas the Republicans did not vote unanimously. Can a Senator criticize another Senator on the floor, or any other place; in the future, can the Senator from Louisiana expose wrongdoing on the part of a Senator, if that rule is followed?

Mr. LONG. It is my understanding and feeling that if a Senator makes charges against another Senator as being guilty of dishonest, unpatriotic, or traitorous conduct, and if the question is brought before the Senate by way of a resolution to censure the Senator making the charge, if the Senator making the charge does not proceed to support it or to prove it, then it seems to me he is liable to be condemned just as he should be liable in a court of law if a slander suit were filed against him. If a Member of this body is accused by a fellow-Member of this body of being a traitor, he is not limited entirely to taking the matter before a court in a slander suit; he can bring it before this body if he cares to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. For a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe we may agree that no one has accused any Senator of being a traitor or of being dishonest.

Mr. LONG. The resolution of censure did relate to members of a committee being accused of dishonesty.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator says that evidence must be brought before the Senate. Let us assume that the Senator from Louisiana knows that Senator X has two Communists working in his office who are dedicated to the destruction of this Government. Let us assume he has 10 witnesses. How does he present the witnesses to the Senate?

Mr. LONG. If I knew that another Senator had two Communists working in his office, and I wanted to bring the matter before the Senate, I would offer a resolution of censure or a resolution that the Senator be expelled; I would bring the facts before an appropriate committee, and if the case could be proved, I believe the Senate would proceed either to censure the Senator or to expel him if his conduct was not worthy of a Senator of the United States.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin is here, and I have not made it clear to him, let me say that it is a matter of record that the Democratic Policy Committee considered the resolution of censure and recommended that Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle should all vote their individual consciences. I was one of the last Senators in making up my mind how I would vote on the subject. It may be of interest to the Senator to know that I actually prepared a speech against the resolution of censure less than 1 week before the vote finally occurred. I discussed it and carefully considered it. I was reminded by one of the leaders that I should vote my own conscience and that the party did not have any preference as to how I should vote. I would not want to call the name of the Senator who told me that, but he was one of the responsible leaders on this side of the aisle.

I believe the Senator from Wisconsin knows that I would not have voted to censure him because a committee may have wanted me to vote one way or the other. I think it was a matter which each Senator should have decided for himself.

But I wish to make it a matter of record at this moment that members of the Democratic Policy Committee told me in private conversation that I should not regard it as being a party matter. That was as late as 2 days before the vote occurred. Those of us who voted for the resolution did not vote for it because we disagreed with the Senator's objectives.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has stated something which reminds me of what I should have said to the Senator from Wisconsin when he asked me earlier about the matter of party discipline.

What the Senator from Louisiana said is correct with reference to me also. Not one Member of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle asked me to vote for or against the McCarthy censure resolution.

As a matter of fact, I made it clear early in the debate that I would not vote for count 2, the Zwicker count, and not once did any Member of the Senate ask

me to change my opinion on that matter or try to influence my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to return to the all-important issue for 1 or 2 minutes.

Will the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that if a person has been hindering the fight against Communists by covering up or coddling Communists, the only way for him to attempt to get a clean bill of health before the American people is to vote for a pious resolution saying, "I am against communism generally"? Will the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LONG. There are many ways by which a person could do an insincere act, but I have never felt that one should accuse others of being insincere unless he has the proof to back up the accusation.

I do not think that Senators on this side of the aisle felt any necessity to cover up or to gain some pardon with regard to the vote of censure, on which they were required to vote.

So far as many Senators were concerned, they had no intention of offering such a resolution; but there was a feeling on the part of some Senators that it should be made clear that they wanted the investigation and the prosecution of anyone connected with the Communist conspiracy to continue. It seems to me it is a compliment to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that such a resolution was submitted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very happy that the resolution contains the word "continue." I consider it a compliment, and I appreciate it very much.

I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, as a final comment, that I am very deeply disturbed by what is happening at this time. I think the Senator will agree with me that while he is as anti-Communist as anyone in the Senate, as is also the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the raw, harsh, unpleasant fact remains that the Democrat Party—I should not say "the Democrat Party"; I should say the Truman party, because there certainly are two branches of the party—over the past 20 years has countenanced the Harry Dexter White type of person, to cite one case. It can be multiplied by hundreds, and the Senator can then get the picture.

The Senator from Louisiana and I know that the Communists are clever. They assign their best men and women to infiltrate our Government. The Senator and I know that some of those persons are still in the Government. They were not all removed last night or the night before.

If the resolution which was adopted today means what it says, then this is a really great day for the United States. But I am not too hopeful that its purpose can be accomplished. I am not too hopeful that those who are in control of the Democrat Party—and I do not believe the Daniels and the Longs are

in control of the Democrat Party—will allow Senators to dig out from underneath the dark recesses the persons who have been nurtured and encouraged for 20 years. I rise today only to point out that the resolution is meaningless unless something shall be done about those persons.

As I said earlier today—and the Chair can call me to order again, if he desires to do so—it is my opinion that many Senators who sponsored the resolution and voted for it will raise every obstacle they possibly can when an attempt is made to dig out individual Communists. They will be satisfied if we dig up well-known Communists, such as the Earl Browders and the Posters, and others who are well known in the Communist Party, and parade them before a committee. They will not scream about that. But when an attempt is made to get down beneath the planks and pull out Communists who have been in the Government for years and years, I fear we shall hear shouting and screaming on the part of Senators who voted for the resolution. I hope I am wrong.

Mr. LONG. These questions become matters of opinion, as to which each person is entitled to hold his own opinion.

So far as the opinion of the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I do not believe there has ever been a President of the United States who was not a patriotic citizen, who did not act as God gave him the ability to act, so far as he could to preserve the Nation. I believe history will bear out the statement that without exception there has not been a single President who was not a great American patriot, devoted to the welfare and interest of the country. I make that statement without regard to parties or individuals.

While there have been mistakes, I am confident that, so far as the security of the Nation is concerned, the mistakes which have been made have been mistakes of judgment or mistakes resulting from not knowing all the facts. I do not believe they were mistakes of intention, so far as our leaders were concerned.

INCREASED COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall address the Senate quite briefly on a matter of the most serious consequence to thousands of cotton farmers throughout the cotton-producing area, and more particularly to the so-called family-size cotton farmer, the small landowner. My remarks will center around the several measures which have been introduced and sponsored jointly by various of my distinguished colleagues, particularly my colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Those bills were introduced in the Senate on January 10. They are similar in nature, in that they call for increasing the cotton acreage for 1955 from the present 18.1 million acres, as originally an-

nounced by the Secretary of Agriculture, to 19½ million acres. The bills are also similar in regard to the distribution to the States of the national acreage.

I hasten to point out that we have made every possible effort to stay close to the basic formula in the present law, and therefore to enable the States to maintain their present relationship to the basic formula of a 5-year average.

We are proposing an increase of only 1,400,000 acres, which is designed to take care of inequities, with particular attention to the family-size farm.

The present law, as amended in 1954, provides two basic methods for apportioning county allotments to farmers. The 1954 amendments gave the county committee authority to apportion farm allotments on the basis of the crop-land factor, or on the basis of the 3-year history of planting on individual farms. If the crop-land factor is used, the county committee is required to use the minimum small-farm provision in the present law, which provides that each farm shall be allocated, so far as possible, the smaller of 5 acres or the highest planted cotton acreage in 1952, 1953, or 1954.

If the history base is used, the county committee has permissive authority either to use or to ignore the small-farm provision I have just described. I understand that the Department of Agriculture has estimated that 92 percent of the counties selected and used the history base as a method of apportionment and with only a few exceptions have not used the small-farm provision. It is my understanding that only 85 out of 984 counties used the small-farm provision, and 50 of those counties were in Oklahoma. This formula, while having desirable features from the standpoint of flexibility, has in many cases caused serious reduction in acreage to the family-size farmer, and is so drastic in many instances that it actually put him out of business.

Mr. President, if I may have the especial attention of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are present in the Chamber at this time, I should like to refer to a specific example of the operation of the present apportionment in my home State and my home county, where I know the people, where I know the land, and where I know the history of the families who occupy the land. I went on some of those farms during the Christmas holidays, and I found there small cotton farmers whose people have lived on that land for more than 100 years. However, as a result of the operation of these provisions, those farmers have actually been reduced to the point where each of them has less than 1 acre of cotton which he is permitted to plant for the year 1955. There are many cases of that sort. In many instances, the farmers are permitted to plant less than 2 acres or less than 3 acres. I think such a situation is comparable to that of a factory worker who might be permitted to work only 1 hour a day, and whose family would be expected to receive their sustenance from so limited an income.

Actually, Mr. President, in that county there are 1,584 cotton farmers; and more

than 700 of them have such small cotton-acreage allotments under the present law that they would be affected by the enactment of these bills. However, the bills, if enacted, will require the allotment of only 1,200 acres in the county in order to take care of the deficiency and to bring the individual allotments up to the point where those farmers would have what heretofore has been considered the least possible acreage required in order to enable a cotton farmer to keep body and soul together, in the case of both himself and his family.

Mr. President, I am not referring to an imaginary situation. On the contrary, I am referring to what has actually occurred. Over 50 percent of the farmers in that county would be affected by the proposed allowance of 1,200 additional acres. Other provisions of the bills would bring about a modification of the present small-farm provision, and would require that the 1,200 additional acres, to which I have just referred, be apportioned to farmers on a basis similar to that under which they received their original allotments.

Mr. President, even though the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry do not agree with this provision of the bills, I am encouraged by the fact that, as they understand conditions at the present time, they are entirely willing to have thorough hearings held on this situation, particularly in regard to the drastic reductions in acreage allotments. Let me say that I sincerely appreciate the attitude of the members of the committee, and I trust that they will speedily go into this matter, because if additional acres are to be planted in cotton, they must be planted soon, or else it will be too late.

The bills which we have introduced are designed to bring back a normal relationship to these family-size units; and they direct that the increased acreage be apportioned, to the extent such acreage is available, to increase each farm allotment heretofore established to the smaller of 5 acres or the highest planted in the 3 previous years. This is the same provision contained in section 344 (f) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, but makes it mandatory that the increase be used for this purpose.

Mr. President, let me point out that all that is proposed by means of these bills is that Congress shall take action to restore, for 1955, the minimum requirement which always heretofore has been considered essential and necessary for the small farm operators if they are to sustain themselves and keep body and soul together. Of course, in some counties the proposed additional acres would not be used for the purpose provided by the bills, but would be distributed to other farms where the need is the greatest. A few counties in Mississippi had sufficient allotments to meet the requirements of the small-farm operators to whom I have referred, and thus they have been taken care of. But the great majority of the counties throughout the entire cotton-producing belt are in great need of the relief I mention.

Other proposals would provide for a modification of the present small-farm provision by providing for the smaller of 4 acres or the highest planted in the 3 previous years, and still another proposal would provide for the smaller of 4 acres or 75 percent of the highest planted in the 3 previous years. While the bills vary in method of apportionment of State acreage to county and farm, they are all identical in distribution of allotments to States, and preserve the formula in the present law. This provision is designed to insure the small operator the barest minimum for basic, essential needs of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table listing the cotton States, with their present allotments and the proposed increases under the bills that have been introduced. Although the figures are believed to be accurate, it is possible that they may be at some variance with the absolutely correct figures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton allotments by States—Actual allotments, 1954-55, and proposed increases for 1955

State	Actual allotment for 1954, 21,379,358 acres	Actual allotment for 1955, 18,113,208 acres	Proposed increase over actual allotment for 1955 if national allotment is increased to 19.5 million acres
Alabama.....	1,346,401	1,101,804	84,382
Arizona.....	413,820	333,933	25,575
Arkansas.....	1,847,036	1,529,704	117,153
California.....	936,408	778,686	59,636
Florida.....	44,116	36,283	2,779
Georgia.....	1,188,894	950,818	72,819
Illinois.....	4,000	3,056	None
Kansas.....	80	35	None
Kentucky.....	10,799	8,374	641
Louisiana.....	750,436	648,442	49,661
Mississippi.....	2,079,833	1,750,852	134,090
Missouri.....	462,617	399,627	30,605
Nevada.....	2,280	2,324	None
New Mexico.....	218,942	182,194	13,953
North Carolina.....	624,831	515,714	39,496
Oklahoma.....	1,098,283	872,532	66,823
South Carolina.....	929,030	773,945	59,273
Tennessee.....	680,683	593,868	45,482
Texas.....	8,719,178	7,612,779	583,027
Virginia.....	21,682	18,238	1,397
United States.....	21,379,358	18,113,208	1,386,792

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize the fact that I am mindful of the present supplies of cotton and the obligation which the cotton farmer has to bring supplies in line with the demand. This very fact has caused me to be very cautious and to study this entire problem before seeking legislation to increase the 1955 acreage allotment. However, after a visit to my home State and having a firsthand look at the severe hardships facing the family-size farmer, I am fully convinced that there are many grave and drastic hardships which demand adjustment.

The economic situation facing most cotton farmers makes it extremely difficult to stand another downward adjustment in cotton acreage. In addition to finding themselves in a price-cost squeeze of paying more for what they

buy and receiving less for the things which they sell, the farmers have not recovered from the severe financial setback resulting from a drought last year. This is particularly true of the small farmer who has completely exhausted his credit availability and finds it almost impossible to shift to new crops which are costly and in which he has had little or no experience.

In that connection, I should like to point out that it is necessary for a great many of the small operators I am talking about to borrow money in order to finance the making of a crop. A man with an allotment which is as low as many of these allotments are cannot go to a bank and obtain any kind of financial support for the making of that crop.

I have before me a letter from one of the leading bankers in my State, Mr. W. C. Neill. He is a down-to-earth type of man and knows the problems of the farmers in the making of a crop. The letter reads:

LEFLORE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Greenwood, Miss., December 20, 1954.
Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
DeKalb, Miss.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: The cotton allotments proposed for 1955 are at levels which will induce lending agencies to be extremely critical in making production furnish advances on 1955 crops. In several instances that have come to my attention, allotments are insufficient to provide means for repayment of nominal advances.

If these critical cases cannot be remedied by a decent increase in cotton acreage, there will be no alternative other than to direct loan applicants in such brackets to Federal agencies for assistance—or subsistence.

With best regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

W. C. NEILL.

Mr. President, Mr. Neill very tersely states the situation confronting the small cotton farmers.

I do not contend that the proposed small increase in acreage provides a lasting solution to our cotton problem, but it does provide an emergency measure for the small farmers who depend on cotton acreage for their livelihood.

I feel that this situation emphasizes the need for developing a long-range program which will enable cotton farmers and other farmers to reduce the cost of production and improve the quality of their products in a program designed to meet competition, to expand markets, and to reduce surpluses. I firmly believe that research and education will help provide the long-range solution to this and other agricultural problems, and I hope to have a chance to present my full views on that subject at a later date.

I emphasize the fact that research or any other activity will not meet the situation for this year.

The small operator, against whom this acreage plan works so drastically, has always voted in favor of a cotton acreage controls program, and he did so in 1954 after his acreage was so drastically reduced. But he so voted in the firm belief that the inequities of the situation would be remedied. It is grossly unfair to fail to hear his plea now.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize that fact. These men, against whom the acreage plan works so drastically, and

whose acreage has been reduced below the minimum, were completely confident that the inequities of the situation would be adjusted, and with that confidence they voted in favor of acreage controls. They are not the kind of people who write letters. They do not send letters in great volume. They depend upon their elected representatives in Congress to do something about the situation.

I see no sound reason why the administration cannot support some proposal of this nature. In doing so they would not abandon or compromise their position in a sliding scale support program, nor the acreage control program, which goes with it. This is merely remedial legislation to cover hardship cases which may occur under any formula which may be adopted by the distribution of acreage. Many of these hardship cases involve small farmers, and the acres necessary to bring them relief will add very little to the total annual production.

It is significant to note that if the bills are passed the surpluses will still be reduced considerably, according to all present calculations. It should be remembered that the farmer who has built up the surpluses is not the one I have been talking about, who has been drastically affected by the reduction. If relief is given to the small operator under a putting together of the main features of the bills that have been introduced, the relatively small amount he will produce over and above what he is allotted now will not seriously affect our surplus situation.

I appeal to the Department of Agriculture to actively take the lead in meeting this grave situation. The Department has the far-reaching operating machinery to put into effect this program that extends over 1,000 counties of the Nation. It can speedily bring the full facts before Congress and its recommendations will carry tremendous weight in obtaining favorable action by Congress.

Approximately 10 days ago I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting that the information be obtained. Orders have been sent to the various counties throughout the Cotton Belt to assemble this information. That is being done now. It is anticipated that the major part of the information will be in the hands of the Department during the first few days of next week.

Mr. President, soon it will be too late. The small operator—be he landowner or tenant—is having to stand by amidst his uncertainty while the deadline for planting cotton daily draws nearer. He does not know what his acreage will be. He does not know how he will be financed. The tenant does not know where he will live in 1955. There is nothing he can do about it until Congress acts.

Therefore, Mr. President, again with complete confidence in our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I call on the committee to fully study the problem.

The farmers are faced with a critical situation, and I hope the committee will speedily approve one of the bills and report it to the Senate at a very early date.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the remarks he has made.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator stated that the farmers who are the hardship cases are not organized letterwriters. I agree. On the other hand, the great bulk of my mail since returning to Washington has come from farmers who come under the category of hardship cases.

It is not an organized letterwriting campaign, but one in which many individuals express the same hardship in their own separate ways. They are letters from individual citizens telling their representatives in Washington the hardships that are being forced upon them by the present cotton-allotment program.

I join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in expressing the hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture will do something about the situation, so that we may stop the movement away from the small farms and the discouragement of the young men who would like to go into farming. We need some kind of legislation or some change in the program along the line suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject, written by Mr. Walter Malec, and published in the Hallettsville (Tex.) Tribune of January 7, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MANY MORE?

Our small farmers are victims of policies which are one-sided and unwise because unjust, to say the least. There is also no doubt as to their effect.

The high tariff is forcing our farmers to plant less and less cotton, while other countries produce more and more, as the result of our tariff policy. Mexico just had a record crop, also not without the help of our own capital.

The parity is paid in the price with a full knowledge that it will act as a serious handicap to our cotton in the world market.

Our allotment policy cut those at the bottom the same as those at the top, contrary to our income-tax policy. If this tax would be levied the same way, it would make it impossible for the small people to make a living, just as this allotment policy does to the small farmers.

Under this policy, the cotton acreage is taken from our old cotton counties and given to the new ones. While our small farmers must plant less, the large producers can plant more in the new cotton counties.

The cotton allotment is in acreage, the same for those producing two bales or more per acre as for the others averaging a half bale or less.

Can anything else be expected than the farm families by the thousands being driven into the cities?

For instance, this congressional district lost some 8,000 farm families, about 25 percent, as did the State and the rest of the South.

Certainly never before were so many family farmers wiped out as since 1940—with all it means to the country. There is already a talk of a farm depression spreading also into the cities.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON sees the farm depression already on—yet almost utterly ignored, much less understood.

Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY believes the answer is in a higher farm income—of little help to small farmers unless they can produce and sell more cotton.

From independent farmers are being made people dependent only on jobs.

Instead of helping more people to settle on the farms, we are losing them wholesale.

And instead of dividing the large estates into small farms to make more independent people, we are wiping out the small ones and making bigger farms, the same as the Communists do. The same results, only a different method. Nothing else can be expected—but are those policies inevitable?

Must our small farmers be sacrificed to our tariff policy?

Must our parity be used as a price handicap?

And must those at the bottom be cut the same as those at the top?

And should not the allotment be in lint instead of acreage, in justice to all?

Also, must the cotton acreage be taken from the old and given to the new counties?

And must we force our farmers to plant less while we encourage other countries to produce more cotton?

That the mechanized farming is responsible for this trend is only a sinister fallacy—which has nothing to do at all with the above policies.

So much has happened to our farmers, yet so little is known, much less understood.

How much more must happen?

How many more farmers must be sacrificed?

How much more must our very foundation be weakened by those blind and stupid policies?

Only Congress, now in session, can give this answer.

THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when Premier Mendes-France addressed the Senate a few weeks ago, I am certain that all of us were impressed with the sincerity and courage of the man. Therefore, it is disturbing to learn that during recent weeks, even since the adjournment of the French Assembly, rumors and reports have been circulating throughout Europe to the effect that the Government of the United States and our top officials have written off France as a country which is unable to govern itself, and have made rather discouraging and disparaging remarks about that great country.

Under date of January 13, there was syndicated in the United States a dispatch from Paris entitled "What France Resents," written by Seymour Freidin and William M. Richardson, which bears out the statement I have made that such reports are being circulated throughout Europe, especially in France, at the present time.

I do not have the original dispatch, but I hold in my hand the text of an article which was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 14, 1955, in the form of an advertisement presented as a public service by International Latex Corporation.

In the dispatch it will be noted that the reports circulating throughout

Europe actually imply that Secretary Dulles himself is beginning to believe that the French have lost the capacity to govern themselves. Some of us have frequently been briefed by Secretary Dulles during the past year; and I, for one, wish to say that, to the best of my knowledge, he has never implied, in any way, that the French people have lost the ability to govern themselves.

It seems to me that France, which was ravaged and weakened by two wars within a generation, is making a gallant and successful effort to become stronger.

Although we cannot control the thoughts or the language of everyone in the United States any more than can be done in any other country, I believe that confidence in France and the French people is increasing, not only among our Government officials, but also among the people of the country as a whole. We have not lost our faith in the ability of France to maintain her place among the great nations of the world, and I think we should tell them so and should do what we can to overcome the baseless rumors which undoubtedly are being circulated by those who mean no good either to France or the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the dispatch referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FRANCE RESENTS

PARIS, January 13.—France is profoundly disturbed over reports from Washington that this country is being "written off" as unstable and unreliable, despite recent ratification of the London and Paris agreements in the French National Assembly.

These reports have been given wide circulation throughout Europe during the past fortnight. The BBC has featured them on its main news programs and they have been given wide—and doubtless gratifying—circulation in Germany.

The reports began with Washington dispatches in American newspapers shortly before Christmas which said that Secretary Dulles was beginning to believe that the French had lost the capacity to govern themselves.

Such sentiments were echoed in other dispatches which said Defense Department officials were known to feel that France was no longer a good risk, at least as an anchor of Western defense. The implication was that they would seek other and more reliable real estate on which to build further bulwarks for defense.

Dulles' statement about French incapacity to govern themselves was made before Premier Mendes-France, fighting one of the great parliamentary battles of all time, finally rammed the Paris and London agreements through the National Assembly. But what disturbs France even more is that the echoes of this same sentiment, attributed to the Defense Department, were made after France's Assembly had given the green light to German sovereignty and rearmament.

The French are asking: Are these doubts quite fair, or even justified, within a week of the historic and successful Assembly debate? If American confidence was so completely shaken, why choose this of all moments to give it expression?

For the politicians and people of this country were under the impression that, if they did not ratify German rearmament, then their prestige would be finished in America. But they were certainly not under the impression that when their Assembly

ratified that the name of France would be mud at any rate.

The Dulles threat of an agonizing reappraisal, they believed, held good only so long as France procrastinated on these issues, not when it took firm and forceful action.

To many Frenchmen this new defeatist attitude in the Defense Department—if it was correctly reported—comes as a shock since (1) they have ratified German rearmament in the lower house, (2) France has a leader in Mendes-France who shows signs of pulling the nation out of the polite semianarchy which existed for years, and (3) the Premier is preparing next month to push through his far-reaching economic reform program designed to harden most of the soft spots so long criticized by American economists.

The reports already have created resentment and some French observers believe this Washington attitude will play directly into the hands of the neutralists, the supernationalists, and the Communists. Already, all three of these groups have been arguing along these lines:

"You see, we always told you the Americans are, first and foremost, pro-German. And now that we have voted to give Germany arms and sovereignty, the Americans are no longer interested in us. Only a few weeks ago, when we held the future of the Western Alliance in the hands of our Parliament, the French were noble people who would surely make the noble decision. Now, America is looking elsewhere for her 'bulwark' and where else but Germany?"

Such arguments may be false; at best, gross oversimplification, but they have a powerful emotional appeal.

The French official who risked his constituency in the next general election to vote last week for German rearmament and Western stability will not take lightly to having his political courage put down to instability. In that vote, the United States obtained potential new friends outside the tight little ranks of the fretful MRP and rightwing, some of whose most powerful members voted against or abstained on the rearmament issue.

Many strictly neutral observers here believe that now is the time for the propaganda-and-policy battalions of our State Department here to start cultivating these new pro-Western men of courage—who risked all to vote for Western solidarity—and drop those former leaders of France who procrastinated on the question for 4 long years and then voted against it.

For, if France is to shake the malaise which has gripped her since the Popular Front, then her future lies in the honesty and courage of such men and not in the bitterness of the bad losers which it had been American policy to support, both in the present and the previous administration. (By Seymour Freidin and William M. Richardson in the New York Post.)

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

URGENT NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the conviction that the Congress and the people of the United States would give more favorable consideration to the urgent needs of American shipping if they understood more clearly the importance of that great industry to the economy and security of our country, I invite attention to an advertisement which was published recently by the Gibbs Corp., of Jacksonville, Fla.

Under the heading, "Keep Her Flying," this splendidly phrased advertisement puts in most succinct fashion some basic facts pertaining to the American merchant marine that merit the attention of

every citizen, and every Member of Congress.

The Gibbs Corp. is to be congratulated heartily upon this most timely and most convincing presentation of the plus side of the shipping question. As the members of the public relations panel of the Propeller Club of the United States were reminded at the recent Miami convention of that important national organization, by one of the country's leading authorities on maritime matters, Miss Helen Delich, shipping editor of the Baltimore Sun, the industry must let the people know what a job it is doing for the country; must sell its services to our people, shippers and passengers alike. This the Gibbs advertisement does most persuasively.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP HER FLYING

The tankers, freighters and passenger ships of the United States merchant marine are an investment in peacetime prosperity and wartime security. From the operation of these privately owned ships in peaceful commerce comes a chain reaction of economic benefit to industry and commerce, to labor and agriculture, to every State and every part of the population.

In the Nation's defenses, these same ships are as essential as planes, tanks, and battleships; they are the logistical key to any global emergency. Yet this vital weapon of war earns its keep and pays its own way in peacetime, both directly and in the enormous contribution of the merchant marine to the national economy.

But mothballed ships carry no cargoes, create no jobs, and train no men. Only a great merchant fleet, carrying on this Nation's share of the world's maritime commerce, can bring these benefits. Even as a reserve, a merchant fleet in mothballs will be useless unless there are trained officers, seamen and engineering personnel to man them when needed—and only an active merchant fleet will provide the necessary backlog of men with deep-sea training.

Few Americans outside the maritime industries know the facts or understand the urgency of this question. It is up to us who do know to pass the word—to keep our Representatives in Government informed and alert, to speak up at every opportunity in behalf of the merchant marine, to take an active part in the clubs and organizations working to keep the Stars and Stripes flying on the maritime trade routes of the world.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS AND ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before moving an adjournment, I desire to make a brief announcement.

As stated earlier in the day, in accordance with a request made by the chair-

man of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for leave to file a report when the Senate is not in session, it is the plan of the leadership, after having conferred with the minority leader, to call up on Tuesday next the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I desire that all Senators have adequate notice that the consideration of that bill will be the business before the Senate on Tuesday.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the

Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1961. (Reappointment.)

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1958, vice Charles D. Mahaffie.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Louis LeBaron whose term has expired.

BOARD OF PAROLE

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960. Dr. Killinger is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired September 30, 1954.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment

to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned lieutenants

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1955.

Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1955.

Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1955.

Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1955.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert C. Munson, effective January 9, 1955.

Gerard E. Haraden, effective January 10, 1955.

To be commissioned ensigns

David E. Livingston

Kelly E. Taggart

James D. Slayden

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Centennial of Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am informed that the Post Office Department is about to issue a special postage stamp commemorative of the centennial of the founding of land-grant colleges. It happens that Michigan State College was the first land-grant college, and I ask unanimous consent that some remarks of mine upon the subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA

The Post Office Department is about to issue a stamp commemorating the establishment 100 years ago of the first 2 land grant colleges in the United States—Michigan State College and Pennsylvania State University. This centennial anniversary is a source of real pride to the people of Michigan; and I am particularly proud of the fact that the first of the two colleges to be established was Michigan State College, which is thus the oldest of the land-grant colleges in America.

Michigan State College was actually established before the Federal Land Grant Act, the Morrill Act, was adopted by Congress. It was established with money appropriated by the State legislature in compliance with a requirement in the new State constitution. While Michigan did not wait for Federal money to establish its college, the State was grateful for the aid received when Congress did adopt the Morrill Act in 1862 and made possible an increase of 100 percent in the service rendered to Michigan by the college.

This centennial celebration invites us to take another look at the history of Federal aid to education in this country and to contrast that history with the situation today.

The history shows that the first piece of major legislation in support of public education was adopted by our Federal Government as far back as 1785, even before the adoption of our Federal Constitution. This was the famous Northwest Ordinance, which initiated the policy of setting aside Federal land and Federal moneys to aid education. Since then more than 160 acts have been passed by the Congress to help the States support schools.

A list of the major acts is as follows:

Seventeen hundred and eighty-five: Ordinance of 1785.

Seventeen hundred and eighty-seven: Ordinance of 1787.

Seventeen hundred and ninety-six: Ohio Salt-Land Grant Act.

Eighteen hundred and two: Ohio Enabling Act.

Eighteen hundred and three: Ohio Enabling Act amendment.

Eighteen hundred and thirty-three: United States Deposit Fund Act.

Eighteen hundred and thirty-six: Surplus Revenue Loan Act.

Eighteen hundred and forty-one: Internal Improvement Act.

Eighteen hundred and fifty: Swamp-Land Grant Act.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-two: Morrill Act.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-seven: Department of Education Act.

Eighteen hundred and eighty-seven: Hatch Act.

Eighteen hundred and ninety: Second Morrill Act.

Nineteen hundred and six: Adams Act.

Nineteen hundred and seven: Nelson amendment to Morrill Act.

Nineteen hundred and eight: Federal Forest Reserve Fund Act.

Nineteen hundred and eleven: State Marine School Act.

Nineteen hundred and fourteen: Smith-Lever Act.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen: Smith-Hughes Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty: Federal Mineral Royalty Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty: Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-five: Purcell Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven: Federal School Land Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight: Capper-Ketcham Act.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine: George-Reed Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four: George-Ellzey Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-five: Bankhead-Jones Act.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six: George-Deen Act.

Nineteen hundred and forty: Vocational education for national defense.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four: GI bill of rights.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five: Amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act.

History reminds us that the States have not sat on their hands waiting for the Federal Government to do it all. As Michigan did in the case of its State college, the States have taxed themselves for their schools, only turning to the Federal Government for help over and above what they themselves were able to do. History shows also that even when Federal aid was generously given, it was given without any requirement that the States give up control over their school systems. This thing that some people claim to fear today—the loss of local control over education—just has not happened in the past. It need not happen today.

Today, surveys of school needs have made clear the fact that our children need more than \$10 billion worth of school construction. The facts have been presented over and again. The States are laboring to do their share to meet these needs. But the Federal Government, unlike some periods in the past, is sitting on the sidelines, waiting for the matter to be hashed over at 49 conferences before it decides how to act, if at all.